The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.
INGRAM BYWATER, M.A.
AND
HENRY JACKSON, LITT. D.

VOL. XX.

London and Cambridge:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO. CAMBRIDGE
1892

1724

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

CONTENTS.

No. XXXIX.

	PAGE
Seneca in Alain of Lille. JOHN E. B. MAYOR	1
Notes on the Odyssey. ARTHUR PLATT	7
An Oxford MS. of Statius' Silvae. ROBINSON ELLIS . . .	17
Sophoclea. A. E. HOUSMAN	25
Remarks on the Vatican Glossary 3321. A. E. HOUSMAN . .	49
Notes on the Vatican Glossary 3321 (ed. Goetz). H. NETTLESHIP .	53
Caesar's Invasion of Britain. HENRY ELLIOT MALDEN . . .	63
St Polycarp to the Philippians. C. TAYLOR	65
Soph. O. T. 846. *οἰόζωνον* not a *separable* epithet. GEORGE YOUNG	111
Notes on Alexandra and Lithica. ARTHUR PLATT . . .	113
Plato's Later Theory of Ideas. G. LOWES DICKINSON . . .	121
The Bodleian MS. of Eusebius's Chronicle. E. W. B. NICHOLSON .	134
On Plautine Metre. W. M. LINDSAY	135

No. XL.

	PAGE
Lucretianum. Robinson Ellis	159
Notes on Plutarch, de Iside et Osiride. W. R. Paton . . .	162
Notes in Latin Lexicography. H. Nettleship	175
Tonitralis in Lucretius 2 1105. H. Nettleship	181
Note on Hom. Od. Bk. 17, L. 486. Fred. C. Conybeare . .	182
The Vatican Glossary No. 3321. H. Nettleship	183
Notes on the Vatican Glossary 3321. (*Concluded.*) H. Nettleship	185
A Note on Caesar's Invasions of Britain. A. G. Peskett . .	191
On some Passages of the Helene of Euripides. Hugh Macnaghten	202
The Rehdiger MS of *Aetna*. Robinson Ellis	207
The Manuscripts of the Iliad. II. Walter Leaf	237
Notes on Juvenal Satire VIII. John E. B. Mayor . . .	252
Various Conjectures I. Walter Headlam	294
Emendations of Tibullus and Martial. J. P. Postgate . . .	312
Lucretiana. J. D. Duff	315

THE JOURNAL

OF

PHILOLOGY.

SENECA IN ALAIN OF LILLE.

MANY years ago, having occasion to read the works of Alanus de Insulis (Migne, *Patrologia* CX, cf. *Hist. Lit. de la France* XVI), I wrote on the fly-leaf of my copy of Haase's Seneca passages professing to be quotations from that author. Most of them certainly are taken from extant works of Seneca, and, as I have not anywhere found in editions or dissertations any trace of acquaintance with Alanus, I think it worth while to call public attention to the question. If Alanus used works of Seneca now lost, we may hope to recover other fragments from contemporary or earlier or even later writers.

Alanus, Summa de arte praedicandi 3 col. 118[a] Migne: *Quia ut ait Seneca:* haec in quibus delectatur uulgus, tenuem habent et superfusoriam uoluptatem; et quodcumque uiuentium (r. inuecticium) gaudium est, fundamento caret. The word *superfusorius* is found in the Old Latin, Exod. xxxviii 17 Lugd., but is not likely to have been used by Seneca. In Seneca ep. 23 § 5 we read haec quibus d. u., t. h. ac perfusoriam u., et q. inuecticium g. e., f. c.

ibid. 7 col. 126[a]: *Seneca ait:* maxima iactura est, quae per neglegentiam fit. This is from ep. 1 § 1 *turpissima tamen* est iactura, quae per neglegentiam fit.

ibid. 11 col. 134[b]: cupiditatum finis etiam ad timoris remedia proficit *et, ut Seneca dicit,* 'spem metus sequitur.' prouidentia, maximum bonum condicionis humanae, in malum uersa est; ferae pericula quae uident fugiunt, cum effugere secure possunt: nos et uenturo torquemur et praeterito. multa bona nostra nobis nocent. timoris enim tormentum memoria reducit, prouidentia anticipat. nemo tantum praesentibus miser est. Not only the three words marked as a citation, but the whole passage is from Sen. ep. 5 e.g. § 7 *apud Hecatonem nostrum inueni* cupiditatium finem etiam ad timoris remedia proficere ..... spem metus sequitur.

What follows is found word for word in §§ 8, 9, except that for *secure possunt,* the better reading *securae sunt* is preserved.

ibid. 17 col. 146[d]: *Seneca ait:* 'compositae mentis est posse consistere et in bono morari.' nihil tam utile est quod in transitu possit prodesse. Here also the quotation reaches further than the inverted commas. Sen. ep. 2 § 1 *primum argumentum* compositae mentis *existimo,* posse consistere et *secum* morari. § 3 nihil tam utile est, *ut* in transitu *prosit.*

c. 18 col. 150[c]: *unde Seneca ait:* prope est ut condemnes (r. *-et*) libenter, qui cito; prope est ut inique puniat subditos, qui nimis; moderate imperare, laudabile est. This is from de clem. I 14 § 3 prope enim est ut libenter damnet, qui cito. prope est, ut inique puniat, qui nimis. 18 § 1 *seruis* imperare moderate laus est. What follows is also from Seneca, though not so marked, and in some words corrupt: natura conuincat esse (r. commenta est) regem, quod ex aliis animalibus licet cognoscere, *quibus natura praeficit regem,* ut apibus, eum tamen natura nec saeuum esse uoluit nec ultionem magno constantem petere. zelum (r. *telum*) quoque eius retrahit (r. *de-*) et inermem relinquit, *quia, ut ait Seneca,* iracundissimae et pro captu corporis pugnacissimae sunt apes, et aculeos in uulnere relinquunt, rex ipse sine aculeo est, exemplar magnis rebus (r. regibus) *existens.* pudeat ab *istis* animalibus

non trahere mores, cum tanto moderatior animus hominum esse debeat, quanto uehementius nocere potest. Sen. ibid. 19 § 2 natura enim commenta est regem, quod et ex a. a. l. c. et ex apibus. § 4 noluit illum natura nec saeuum esse nec ultionem magno constaturam petere telumque detraxit et iram eius inermem reliquit. § 2 iracundissimae ac pro corporis captu pugnacissimae cet. .... sine aculeo est. § 3 exemplar hoc magnis regibus est. § 4 pudeat ab exiguis a. n. t. m., c. t. hominum moderatior esse animus d., q. u. nocet.

c. 21 col. 155^{b}: *ut ait moralis philosophus Seneca*: 'si uis amari, ama.' This is from Hecaton (Sen. ep. 9 § 6).

c. 22 col. 156^{b}: *tunc saeuit ad similitudinem* maris, *nunc tranquilla est, tunc statim* euertitur, *et, ut ait Seneca,* eadem die ubi fluxerint nauigia, sorbentur. Sen. ep. 4 § 7: momento mare euertitur. eodem die [ubi] luserunt nauigia, sorbentur.

c. 23 p. 157^{b}: *Seneca ait:* "quisquis prudentiam sequi desiderat, ductu rationis bene uiuere incipiat, et non dignitatem rebus ex opinione, sed ex earum natura constituat." [See below.]

At the end of the chapter Seneca is not cited by name, but the following words (col. 159^{d}) are in substance his: se contentus est *prudens* ad beate uiuendum. *unde Crispus* (r. Chrysippus) ait "sapientem nulla re egere," summum *enim in se* bonum *habet et ideo* extrinsecus instrumenta *bonitatis* quaeri non oportet. Cf. Sen. ep. 9 § 13 se contentus est sapiens ad beate uiuendum. § 14 uolo tibi Chrysippi quoque distinctionem indicare. ait sapientem nulla re egere. § 15 summum bonum extrinsecus instrumenta non quaerit.

ibid. col. 159^{bc}: incipit *enim* fortunae esse subiectus, *qui aliquam* partem *bonitatis* quaerit *extrinsecus. prudens uero* intra se omne bonum terminat, *et si omne bonum fortunae amittat, clamabit:* omnia mea mecum sunt, *scilicet* prudentia, iustitia, *fortitudo,* temperantia. *omnia* quae eripi possunt, bona non putat. Sen. ibid. § 15 incipit

fortunae esse subiectum, si quam partem sui foris quaerit. § 18 omne intra bonum terminabit et dicet quod Stilbon ille dixit ..... "omnia mea mecum sunt." [id est iustitia], uirtus, [temperantia] prudentia, hoc ipsum nihil bonum putare, quod eripi possit.

c. 24 col. 159^{c}: *Seneca ait* "si magnanimus fueris, numquam iudicabis tibi contumeliam fieri: de inimico dices: non nocuit mihi, sed animum nocendi habuit." The thought runs through Sen. const. sap., but these words are not there. [See below.]

c. 25 col. 172 (of temperance): *Seneca ait:* "temperetur uita inter bonos mores et publicos: magnus ille est qui sic fictilibus utitur quemadmodum argento; nec ille minor est qui sic argento utitur quemadmodum fictilibus." *idem ait:* "*nec* sordeat *nec nimis* splendeat *habitus.* in mediocritate uirtus est, non in deiectione." The last clause should not have been marked as a quotation. The first quotation is literal from Sen. ep. 5 §§ 5, 6 (except that Sen. has *fictilibus sic*). The second from § 3 non splendeat toga, ne sordeat quidem.

c. 29 col. 168^{d}, 169^{a}: *quidam sunt qui os in orando polluunt et animam inficiunt. de his Seneca ait:* "nunc quanta est dementia hominum! turpissima uota Deo insusurrant; si quis amouerit (r. *ad-*) aurem, conticescent: quod homines scire nolunt, Deo narrant. sic cum hominibus uiue, tamquam Deus uideat, sic loquere cum Deo, tamquam homines audiant." From Sen. ep. 10 § 5 almost without a change.

c. 36 col. 179^{d}: *item Seneca:* "*uita* sine litteris mors est et uiui hominis sepultura." Sen. ep. 82 § 3 otium s. l. m. e. et h. u. s.

ibid. col. 180^{b}: *quia, ut ait Seneca:* "planta quae saepe transfertur, non conualescit; *et* medicamentum *saepe mutatum* ad uulneris cicatricem non *peruenit.*" Sen. ep. 2 § 3 non uenit uulnus ad cicatricem, in quo medicamenta temptantur. non conualescit planta q. s. t.

id. Distinctiones dictionum theol. under *quam* (col. 918^{c}): *et Seneca dicit:* "*aeque sit tibi laudari a turpibus quam laudari*

ob turpia." A similar thought in Sen. ep. 29 § 11 : conciliari nisi turpi ratione amor turpium non potest. [See below.]

ibid. under *sal* col. 931[d] *dicitur reprehensio uel detractio, unde uenerabilis Seneca*[1] *dicit:* "Dentes tui sine sale sint," *id est non habeas uerba.* [See below.]

It is not credible that Alanus would call Seneca 'venerable,' or that Seneca would use *sal* in this sense.

I hope that some young scholar may find leisure to examine all the quotations in Alanus, and compare them with those in John of Salisbury and other mediaeval writers.

P.S. Since the above was in type, I have found the source of all the remaining quotations, in a tract which I have often read, and which is printed at the end of Haase's Seneca (III 468—475). I had perused rapidly nearly half of Seneca, when I thought of looking in a book of patristic proverbs for 'Dentes tui sine sale sint.' I found the intelligible form 'sales tui sine dente sint,' *let your wit be without malice,* cited from Martin. episc. Dumiensis de continentia c. 3[2]. This tract is in Migne vol. LXXII, and this citation on col. 26[a]. Here too (col. 27[a]) is Hecaton's famous love charm. Alanus col. 157[d] occurs in Martin 23[c]; Alanus 159[c], in Martin 25[a]; Alanus 918[c], in Martin 26[a]. My experience in this hunt may illustrate the crying need of a lexicon to the Senecas[3]. I have been familiar with

[1] Migne adds in a bracket [ed. Sene.].

[2] Plainly the gloss (*reprehensio vel detractio*) belongs to *dens*, and the article has strayed from its place under letter D.

[3] That martyr to exact scholarship, Wilhelm Studemund (in *Breslauer Philolog. Abhandlungen* II 3, 1888, *De Senecae Philosophi Librorum Recensione et Emendatione scripsit Otto Rossbach. Insunt Senecae Fragmenta Palatina*), after speaking (p. XXV) of some collections from Seneca, by which he had illustrated the Palatine fragments, calls on scholars to turn their attention to 'Annaean' latinity. "Nec me fugit, quantopere illum similium locutionum apparatum supplendo augere potuissem, si denuo perlectis omnibus Senecae libris ne unum quidem exemplum ad comparandum idoneum oculos meos effugere passus essem. Sed ad alias ac maiores occupationes auocatus doleo quidem, quod pro utilibus utiliora Tibi offerre non licet, attamen, dum lexico Annaeanae uerborum copiae pleno et absoluto caremus, non uereor, ne haec collecticia opera Tibi uideatur prorsus superuacanea. Speramus autem fore, ut mox hominum doctorum studia, quae nunc aestu quodam efferuescunt in examinanda atque aestimanda Taciti uerborum copia, qui Senecae non tantum

the philosopher for more than forty years; I have made large lexicographical collections from father and son; yet I did not think it safe to affirm that these citations, striking as they are, are not in Seneca, until I had read him again. As to the citations themselves, I have little doubt that col. 159^{c} is a genuine utterance of Seneca. The word *animus* is inadequately treated in the lexicons, though Georges gives examples from Vell. and Justin of its use with the genitive of the gerund, and Nettleship (*Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, p. 203 n. 5) has three examples from Gaius, one from Tacitus, one from a Roman inscription A.D. 488. Add Plin. pan. 39 § 2 f. *non tam* praestandi animo, *quam* negandi. Paulus in dig. XLVII 10 26 *sed hoc utcumque tunc locum habere potest, quoties ille, qui suadet,* animum iniuriae faciendae *habet.* Brisson will shew that this use is common in the lawyers.

Peiper's index of sources, appended to his edition of the Latin Heptateuch, proves how wide was the reading of Gallic scholars in the sixth century. How far later writers, such as John of Salisbury, who display a large acquaintance with antiquity, were indebted to *florilegia* for borrowed plumes can only be certainly known, when the principal mediaeval collections of this kind have been critically edited, and each author's quotations compared with the ancient classics and with the modern compilers. Woelfflin[1] has made a beginning in this field, and Professor Robinson Ellis has given some attention to the subject.

praecepta philosophiae sed etiam dictionem aliquanto saepius, quam uulgo credunt, in suum usum conuertit, ad Annaeum quoque conferantur, quippe quo perfectiorem argenteae quae uocatur latinitatis auctorem Romam non uidisse constet."

[1] See Teuffel-Schwabe, Gesch. der röm. Lit^{5}. § 212 n. 5 6.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

NOTES ON THE ODYSSEY.

α. 414. *οὔτ' οὖν ἀγγελίῃ ἔτι πείθομαι εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι.*

The optative cannot be right, especially as the poet goes on to a subjunctive. It is due to other passages where the optative is correct, as *β*. 351: *κεῖνον ὀϊομένη τὸν κάμμορον, εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι*. Here the remote contingency may excuse an optative, but in *α*. 414 the sense is "any message that *may have come*," and the Homeric usage makes ἔλθῃ absolutely necessary.

The way in which a familiar passage will corrupt one comparatively unfamiliar may be well illustrated by *ζ*. 286: *καὶ δ' ἄλλῃ νεμεσῶ ἥ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι* due to the famous *ὡς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅ τις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι*. Correct to *ῥέζῃ*. To shew the value of the MSS. on such a question, some of them have *ῥέζει* when *ῥέζοι* is right, though not one lifts its voice against *ῥέζοι* where it is wrong[1].

Again *ρ*. 363:

γνοίη θ' οἵ τινές εἰσιν ἐναίσιμοι οἵ τ' ἀθέμιστοι.

By no possibility can this hyper-Attic *εἰσιν* be right in Homer. ECAN or EEN (*ἦσαν* or *εἶεν*) must have been the original[2].

So in M. 59 for *μενοίνεον εἰ τελέουσι* read *μενοίναον εἰ τελέοιεν*. The construction of *τελέουσι* is as incredible as the form *μενοίνεον*, unless both be taken as signs of very late interpolation, which is not likely. In *ν*. 340, the only line at all

[1] Mr Monro (*Grammar* § 305) explains *ῥέζοι* in *ζ*. 286 as used "where the time is purposely vague.—The Opt. avoids assuming that the case will ever occur." But Nausicaa goes on to assume that the case *does* occur, for she goes on with a subjunctive. In both his parallel passages the reading is most doubtful.

[2] Probably *εἶεν*, for *εἰσίν* appears as a variant for *εἶεν* in *ε*. 89, *κ*. 101.

parallel to M. 59, I do not believe that Fείδε' ὃ νοστήσειs is correct.

γ. 124. ἦ τοι γὰρ μῦθοί γε FεFοικότες, οὐδέ κε φαίης
ἄνδρα νεώτερον ὧδε FεFοικότα μυθήσασθαι.

Though it does not seem to have caused much trouble, yet the construction of μυθήσασθαι is in the highest degree difficult, nay impossible. The only way in which it can be construed at all, so far as I can discern, is as follows: *Verily their speech is alike nor wouldst thou have thought that a younger man* would have spoken *so like his father*, i.e. we must supply κε with μυθήσασθαι from the preceding line. I presume that no one will be any better pleased with this than I am myself. But what is the construction of φημί in Homer? φημὶ γίγνεσθαι = λέγω ὅτι γίγνεται, φημὶ γενέσθαι = λέγω ὅτι ἐγένετο, φημὶ γενήσεσθαι = λέγω ὅτι γενήσεται. To this there is no exception except in one or two passages long since acknowledged to be corrupt by every competent critic. In the present passage then μυθήσασθαι would be equivalent to ὅτι μυθήσατο, which is nonsense. We must read μυθήσεσθαι; to illustrate this corruption would be to paint the lily, but nevertheless I should feel very uncomfortable about even μυθήσεσθαι in this sense of *would say* if I had no parallel to fall back on. Luckily there is one. In that charming compliment to Nausicaa by which Odysseus so wisely ingratiates himself with her parents, he says (η. 292):

ἦ δ' οὔ τι νοήματος ἤμβροτεν ἐσθλοῦ,
ὡς οὐκ ἂν Fέλποιο νεώτερον ἀντιάσαντα
ἐρξέμεν.

(The last line is no doubt rejected by Payne Knight and others, but (1) there is no good ground for rejecting it, (2) even if it were spurious what could any one supply to Fέλποιο except the future?)

To confuse this plain question by mixing up with it the constructions after other verbs is at least unnecessary. However all verbs of pure saying or thinking follow the same rule in Homer as φημί, but when a verb, as Fεῖπον, means to *com-*

mind, it may take either present or aorist, the latter by preference.

After ὄμνυμι either aorist or future is correct; so in β. 373 we find ὄμοσον μὴ μυθήσεσθαι read by Aristarchus, μυθήσασθαι by the MSS. I conceive that the older construction was ὄμοσον μὴ μυθήσασθαι, literally *swear—do not speak*, and that μυθήσεσθαι was then admitted as a variation on this, still keeping μή instead of οὐ. Compare the way in which the future came in after οὐ μή in Attic.

γ. 267. πὰρ δ' ἄρ' ἔεν καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀνήρ.

δ' ἄρ' modern editors against overwhelming MS. evidence for γάρ. I suppose that the reason for preferring δ' ἄρ' is because Nestor has just said: "Clytemnestra at first rejected the overtures of Aegisthus, φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθῇσι." If then Clytemnestra was of virtuous mind (which I take the liberty to doubt, despite the reputation of Nestor for telling truth), how can one go on: "for there was a minstrel man there," as if her virtue required bolstering up by a guardian? I think this objection is quite false. In the first place that polite old gentleman of Pylos was quite aware in his heart that her virtue *did* need a guardian, and in the second to alter γάρ is to spoil just one of the most characteristic and delightful touches of the Odyssean poet. It is exactly his way to give a wrong reason first for any delinquency and then to let the cat out of the bag directly afterwards. To give only one example, that rather weak young man Elpenor having got drunk "forgot" to go down the ladder and so broke his neck. How charming is the account of himself that he gives to Odysseus in the shades, ἆσέ με δαίμονος αἶσα κακὴ καὶ—καὶ—καὶ ἀθέσφατος οἶνος.

δ. 17. τερπόμενοι· μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς
φορμίζων· δοιὼ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς
μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντες ἐδίνευον κατὰ μέσσους.

So MSS. and Aristarchus apparently. ἐξάρχοντος modern editors, as far as I know. Compare Σ. 604:

τερπόμενοι· δοιὼ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς
μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντες ἐδίνευον κατὰ μέσσους.

"For ἐξάρχοντες H has ἐξάρχοντε, which is perhaps right." Leaf. (I should say almost certainly right.) Here "edd. since Wolf have inserted a line from δ. 17, μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς/φορμίζων, and have therefore been obliged to change ἐξάρχοντες to ἐξάρχοντος"—see Leaf further for the reasons for this absurd proceeding. I contend that the true reading in both is as I have printed them above, with the change in each to ἐξάρχοντε. Why should the insertion of the line about the divine bard necessitate ἐξάρχοντος in either passage? If μολπῆς necessarily implied "song," it would be certainly difficult to make the κυβιστητῆρε "lead" it, but μολπῆς does not necessarily imply anything but "dance." Why on earth then should any one boggle at the statement that the bard was singing and two tumblers were leading the dance? Is it because ἐμέλπετο is then used in one sense and μολπή in the other? Truly a serious reason for introducing a construction that can hardly if at all be paralleled in all Homer. And ἐμέλπετο means "played the *dance* tune." It is natural enough that the poet of the ὁπλοποιία in Σ should have taken as much as he wanted from δ and dropped the line about the ἀοιδός. He is fond of quoting the *Odyssey*; see Σ. 386, 425–7, 487–9, 533 etc.

θ. 73. μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέε' ἀνδρῶν,
οἵμης τῆς τότ' ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκανε.

To sing the fame of heroes is all very well, and the κλέος of an οἵμη may well go up to heaven, but how could Demodocus sing the fame of an οἵμη? It would be equally absurd to say that Homer sang the κλέος of the *Odyssey*. Read οἵμην, and let Demodocus no longer blow his own trumpet. οἵμην would be easily attracted by the following τῆς into οἵμης; to suppose that it could be *grammatically* so attracted, like Virgil's *urbem quam statuo uestra est*, is a defence which would argue a strange conception of Homer's manner of speech. Compare θ. 513, where Ἀργείων was attracted by ἄριστοι into the nominative and has only survived in a few MSS. and Macrobius, but is accepted by all editors.

θ. 299. *καὶ τότε δὴ γίγνωσκον ὅ τ' οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλοντο.*

Surely it would be better to read ὅτ'. "They only found out when it was too late to escape."

θ. 396. *Εὐρύαλος δέ μιν αὐτὸν ἀρεσσάσθω Fεπέεσσι.*

It is impossible to extract sense from *αὐτόν*, and Bergler and Lehrs therefore suggest *αὐτός*, which is given by Cauer. But is *αὐτός* much better? What is the point of saying "Euryalus himself"? Why, if *αὐτός* had been in the MSS. we should have had people changing it to *αὐτόν*. Rather compare *ἅψ ἀρέσαι* (I. 120, T. 138) and *ἀπαρέσκομαι*, and remember that Bekker and La Roche's *ὄφρα μιν αὖτις ἰόντα λοχήσομαι* in *δ*. 670 for *μιν αὐτόν* is as certain as any conjecture well can be, and here also restore *μιν αὖτις* for *μιν αὐτόν*.

I have printed *μιν* for *ἑ* though *μιν* is only found in the Augustan. But the more I study the *Odyssey* the more faith I have in this MS. And how is it conceivable that the poet should have said *Fε αὖτις* instead of *μιν αὖτις*, leaving such an inexplicable hiatus? If it be said that *δέ ἑ αὐτόν* is a more difficult reading than *δέ μιν αὐτόν* and that therefore to adopt *μιν* is unscientific, I reply that to *us ἑ αὐτόν* may appear more difficult, but that to the Attic and Alexandrine editors the case was just the other way. *ἑ* was the Attic form for *μιν* and therefore likely to supplant it, as Attic forms have supplanted others all over Homer; to the Attic or Alexandrine ear *ἑαυτόν* was one word and there was no more hiatus than with *μιν αὐτόν*; finally, all late Epic shews that *ἑ* was regularly treated as if it began with a consonant, and so there was no more difficulty about *δέ ἑ* than about *δέ μιν*. The two then being otherwise equal, the familiar Attic *ἑαυτὸν* prevailed. For as it is noted that Aristarchus wrote *ἑ αὐτόν* it is pretty clear that the vulgate was *ἑαυτόν*, as our MSS. give it, in spite of the pronoun not being here reflexive.

θ. 578. *Ἀργείων Δαναῶν καὶ Fιλίου οἶτον ἀκούων.*

That *Ἀργείων Δαναῶν* is wrong seems obvious enough, though it appears to have passed unchallenged till Bekker, who proposed *ἡρώων Δαναῶν*, which somehow does not commend

itself. Ἀργείων τε δόλον van Herwerden, but it is clear from θ. 489, Ἀχαιῶν οἶτον, that we ought not to supply a new noun for Ἀργείων. The same applies to Kayser's νείκεα (τ'?) Ἀργείων, and of Nauck's ἀχρεῖον Δαναῶν the less said the better.

Proper names appear to have been peculiarly liable to go wrong. In γ. 372 the MSS. are divided between Ἀχαίους and ἰδόντας, the former being clearly right though the latter is read by La Roche, Cauer and Ludwich. β. 402 ἑταῖροι—Ἀχαιοί four MSS. λ. 513 μαρναίμεθ' Ἀχαιοί—χαλκῷ Eustathius and La Roche's N. ν. 160 Ἀχαιῶν—ἀγήνορες eleven MSS. I think several more instances might be added.

Again let us consider some other lines like that under discussion. α. 350 Δαναῶν κακὸν οἶτον ἀείδειν, γ. 134 Ἀργείων —πολέες κακὸν οἶτον ἐπέσπον, θ. 489 quoted above. One can see that Ἀχαιῶν or Δαναῶν or Ἀργείων οἶτος was a stock phrase for the disasters that fell upon the Greeks, and κ. 15, Ϝίλιον Ἀργείων τε νέας καὶ νόστον Ἀχαιῶν, is just equivalent to θ. 578. (Ἀργείων τε νέας would perhaps be a better change than any yet suggested.) I am inclined to think that Ἀργείων Δαναῶν arose from an ancient variant, πάντων τ' Ἀργείων and συμπάντων Δαναῶν, or something of the kind, and that it is an attempt to make a compromise between the two.

The objection that Demodocus has only been singing of the οἶτος of Ilios, not of the Greeks, is scarcely worth refuting. Odysseus is thinking of *both* the lays he has heard, not only θ. 449–520 but also θ. 75–82; he must be alluding to the latter in θ. 489 for there is nothing else for that line to refer to.

ι. 88. δὴ τότ' ἐγὼν ἑτάρους προΐην πεύθεσθαι ἰόντας
ἄνδρε δύω κρίνας τρίτατον κήρυχ' ἅμ' ὀπάσσας
οἵ τινες ἀνέρες εἶεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῖτον ἔδοντες.

Such is the order of these lines in the great majority of MSS., and in the best. Moreover it seems from the way in which the story is told that Odysseus sent more than three men up the country of the Lotus-eaters. Consequently Kayser ejects the middle line, followed by Cauer and Ludwich. But the line which is omitted by any MSS. is not this, but the last, which is absent from three of them. Surely then it is a strange thing to

eject the line which all MSS. have and keep a line which three of them have not.

But the extraordinary thing is that when Odysseus comes to Laestrygonia he does the same thing and again the two lines are transposed in the Marcian and in another of Ludwich's MSS. (*κ*. 100–2). Here however all three are apparently genuine, the number of men sent is indubitably three (*κ*. 116–7), and no one has cast any doubt on either of the transposed lines. How are we to account for this, which can scarcely be a coincidence? I see only one way. It is certain that the interpolated place is *ι*. 89, 90, not *κ*. 101, 2. The former then was copied from the latter, and the scribe who first put into the text the two suspicious lines in *ι*, or jotted them down in the margin, copied them from a MS. in which they had been accidentally transposed in *κ*, some MS. from which have descended the Marcian and Ludwich's G. Then owing to the wrong order a few MSS. dropped in *ι* the second interpolated line, or else it never got in from the margin, while a few others guided by the sense transposed them back again.

The result anyhow is that we must eject *both* lines.

ι. 102. *μή πώς τις λωτοῖο φαγὼν νόστοιο λάθηται.*

Interpolated? *λάθηται* is quite wrong, and the line is unnecessary and would be no great loss. If it is genuine one must read *λάθοιτο*. Compare above on *α*. 414, and *Homeric Gr.* § 298, where many similar passages are given which have been corrected. Add *ν*. 402, *π*. 297, *ρ*. 250, *χ*. 392, 444, *ψ*. 135, *ω*. 89, 217. Instances of confusion in the MSS. between indicative, subjunctive, optative are as the sands on the sea shore for multitude.

ι. 389. *πάντα δέ Ϝοι βλέφαρ' ἀμφὶ καὶ ὀφρύας εἷσεν ἀϋτμή.*

By the plural *ὀφρύας* Aristarchus was driven to assume that Polyphemus was *ἑτερόφθαλμος*, having lost the other eye *κατὰ συντυχίαν τινά*, and there can scarcely be a doubt that this view is necessitated by the reading; if an Aristarchus and a Rutherford (*New Phrynichus*, p. 210) feel compelled to adopt it, I at any rate cannot venture to dispute it. But how can we

account for so extraordinary a story? A race of *μονόφθαλμοι γίγαντες* is quite natural in fairy tales, the other view is simply incredible. It is the bucolic diaeresis with its hiatus that is in mischief again; read *ὀφρύα*. Then *βλέφαρα* and *ὀφρύα* may be exactly paralleled from Euripides, who has *Κύκλωπος ἔσω βλεφάρων* in *Cyclops* 485 and *ἐκκαίετε τὴν ὀφρύν* in 658. I do not think however that Euripides read *ὀφρύα* in Homer, for then Aristarchus must have known of the variant and would have surely adopted it sooner than invent a second eye. What Euripides means by talking of the *κόραι* of the single eye in 463 and 611, and of the *Cyclops* himself in 511 as *καλὸν ὄμμασιν δεδορκώς*, passes my comprehension, but one must not be too critical with a poet whose warmest admirers can only defend his tragedies by representing them to be burlesques in the style of Voltaire's *Saül*.

For the corruption and the fable built upon it compare *ρ.* 222: *αἰτίζων ἀκόλους, οὐκ ἄορας οὐδὲ λέβητας*, where some said among other explanations that *ἄορας* was a "metathesis" for *ὄαρας* and meant *wives*! The remarkable thing is that *ἄορα* was known as a variant, but the hiatus seems to have been too much for Aristarchus and most other critics.

κ. 84. *ἔνθα κ' ἄϋπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοὺς ἐξήρατο μισθούς,*
τὸν μὲν βουκολέων τὸν δ' ἀργυφα μῆλα νομεύων.

A sleepless man could naturally do a double day's work in the twenty-four hours, if it were always light, but why should it be necessary for him to change his occupation? A shepherd would stick to his sheep, he would not tend sheep by day and kine by night. Bracket then 85 as an inept and idiotic explanation of the *δοιοὺς μισθούς*, which does not need to be explained at all.

That the poet had no idea whatever in his head of tending different animals at different times is clear from 82:

ὅθι ποιμένα ποιμὴν
ἠπύει εἰσελάων, ὁ δέ τ' ἐξελάων ὑπακούει.

μ. 330. *καὶ δὴ ἄγρην ἐφέπεσκον ἀλητεύοντες ἀνάγκῃ.*

A typical case of the alleged crasis of *δή* with a following

vowel in Homer. Bentley indeed here scanned δὴ ἄγρην as an anapaest, but that is simply impossible, and would never have been thought of by him if he had not been tempted by the desire to defend another conjecture of his own. Well then, δὴ ἄγρην is a spondee; in the old alphabet it would be ΔΕ ΑΓΡΕΝ or ΔΑΓΡΕΝ, I do not care which, and was wrongly transliterated δή for δέ. The construction is very simple, δέ is δέ *in apodosi*, and the line means *They used to contrive hunting also.*

In many other places δή is written with crasis, and so enthusiastic are modern editors for this scansion that they actually have often introduced it where the MSS. give δ'. In every one of them δ' must be restored. To insist on the Attic distinction in Homer is sophistic; we know that the Attic distinction between μέν and μήν does not exist for Homer. Just as μέν for μήν survived in Attic in the collocations, μὲν οὖν and ἀλλὰ...μέν, etc., so δέ for δή survived in the use of δέ *in apodosi*. In Homer that was general which in Attic was more strictly defined. The value of the Alexandrine tradition concerning δέ and δή may be judged from the fact that it gives δἤπειτα or the like for δὴ ἔπειτα; O. 163 is a line I open on at hazard but typical of any number: φραζέσθω δὴ ἔπειτα— "δ' ἠπειτα A δἤπειτα H δή 'πειτα E δ' ἤπειτα CDGL Townl. Vrat. b. d. A. frgm. Mosc. Flor. ΔΗΠΕΙΤΑ Syr." It seems clear enough that the Alexandrines, including Aristarchus, gave δἠπειτα, and La Roche, on his principles, ought to have printed it. Such were the Alexandrine notions on crasis of δή in Homer, and shall *we* pay heed to *them*?

In Λ. 733: ἀμφίσταντο δὴ ἄστυ, A has δέ written over δή, but δή here equals ἤδη and δέ could not mean that, nor can it be δέ *in apodosi*, yet this δέ of A has a most provoking air of genuine tradition before Fάστυ. Then too the imperfect is inferior to the aorist, so that Christ's ἄμφεσταν δὴ Fάστυ must be correct. Yet δή is not supported by L Townl. Vrat. b, which all have δι' ἄστυ, so that if we confine our view to the two best authorities, A and L, δή is altogether uncertain.

o. 475. *νῶ ἀναβησάμενοι.*

νῷ Cobet. Rather νῶ' which is given by one MS., and νῶϊ by another.

τ. 109. ὥς τέ τευ ἦ βασιλῆος ἀμύμονος.

τευ ἦ means of course τε᾽ ἦ, but what is ἦ doing? We have had ἦ in the line before: "Verily thy fame goeth up to heaven as of some verily king"! I have previously observed in a note on γ. 348 that τευ ἤ or ἦ is there most likely a corruption of τεο with ictus lengthening, the ἦ there also being in an impossible position; though it was an after-thought, I am now convinced that it is correct. So here write ὥς τέ τεο βασιλῆος. To write ἤ, and suppose the other alternative dropt, is absurd.

τ. 282. καί κεν πάλαι ἐνθάδ᾽ Ὀδυσσεὺς
ἤην᾽ ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα Ϝοι—

εἴην CDHI, εἴη AL; the latter is clearly right. For the scansion compare α. 207, εἰ δὴ ἐξ αὐτοῖο, ε. 164, ὑψοῦ, ὥς (but query ὑψοῖ᾽?), θ. 468, αἰεὶ ἤματα πάντα, λ. 188 ἀγρῷ, οὐδέ, ξ. 41, ἦμαι, ἄλλοισιν, π. 195, θέλγει, ὄφρ᾽ ἔτι (corrupted to θέλγεις in the cyclic edition as εἴη here to εἴην, ἤην), τ. 383, ὦ γρηῦ, οὕτω φασίν.

τ. 489. οὐδὲ τροφοῦ οὔσης σε᾽ ἀφέξομαι.

It has been proposed to read ἐούσης on the ground that ὤν, οὖσα, is not Homeric for ἐών, ἐοῦσα. However G. Meyer has shewn that περιώσιος is a wrong transliteration of ΠΕΡΙΟΣΙΟΣ for περιούσιος, and this is allowed, I think, by all to be true. Unless then we are prepared to write περιεούσιος, we need not write ἐούσης.

χ. 374. ὡς κακοϜεργίης ἐϋϜεργεσίη μέγ᾽ ἀμείνων.

κακοεργείης ALQ, and if we wrote κακοϜεργείης it would do well enough, but with εὐεργεσίη before our eyes it would be faint-hearted not to write κακοϜεργεσίη at once. This is a good instance of the way in which the long Homeric forms have been ground down, and of the influence of Attic. For the Attic forms are εὐεργεσία and κακοεργία; consequently εὐϜεργεσίη has survived like Nisroch indeed "as one escaped from cruel fight" but still recognisable, while the other has been well-nigh annihilated.

So in ω. 251, whose hapless author could at least scan, read ἀϜεργεσίης for ἀεργίης (ἀργείης Q either for ἀεργείης or by transposition of ε).

ARTHUR PLATT.

AN OXFORD MS. OF STATIUS' SILVAE.

Some years ago I began a partial collation of a MS. of the *Silvae* in the Bodleian, Auct. F. 5. 5 = Barlow 23. It is a MS., seemingly of the later xvth century, written in a very elegant and distinct hand, of a rather unusual type: the chief peculiarity of which is the curious likeness of *b* and *d*, the only difference in these letters being that in the d, the loop is on the left; in both letters this loop rises to a rigid perpendicular line b d. A photographed page will be found in my new Series of Photographs from Bodleian MSS. issued by the Clarendon Press this year (1891). It contains 25 lines in a page; that is to say, generally: for there are cases in which the rule is not observed. Of some portions of the MS. I have sent a collation to Mr Moriz Krohn, who is bringing out an elaborate edition of the *Silvae*: the following remarks are generally based on the variants of our MS., and will I hope prove of some interest to those who, like Mr Hugh Macnaghten and Mr Lendrum, are attracted by the difficulties naturally abounding in a work, all the copies of which seem derived from one archetype, the codex discovered at S. Gallen in Switzerland by Poggio during the Council of Constance. The earliest transcript of Poggio's codex is believed to be at Madrid; of this we shall soon possess an exact knowledge from Mr Krohn.

I. 4. 98 sqq.

Si qua salutifero gemini chironis (*thironis* Bod. m. pr.)
in antro
Verba tholo †*quandocumque tibi troiana recondit*
Pergamus aut medicis foelix epidaurus harenis

Educat idea profert quam creta sub umbra
**Dictamini florentis opem*

99 *Herba* most MSS. *quodcumque* most MSS.
quam cumque Barth; and our MS. seems to support him. It is observable that the other two relatives *Si qua . . quam* are feminine.

107 For *ritu se cingit uterque Paeonio* our MS. gives *cuule cituse.* It is clear from this that in the MS. of which ours is a copy *r* and *c*, *l* and *s* were like each other. It is equally clear that *r* of the original codex was often mistaken for *s*, thus *aste* 112, *lucestis* v. 5. 8 for *arte, lucertis*, and so I think *mostis* for *mortis* v. 1. 181.

I. 5. 47

Nil ibi plebeium nusquam †tenuinessa notabis
Aera sed argento felix propellitur unda
Argentoque cadit
temesea D'Orv. x. 1. 5. 34.

Is it possible that *tenuinessa* is a corruption of *senuessa?* The baths of Sinuessa were famous; and if the metal predominantly used in their construction was bronze, it is conceivable that the poet, addressing Sinuessa, wrote

nusquam, Sinuessa, notabis
Aera

'nowhere, Sinuessa, will you find bronze to carp at in the baths of Claudius Etruscus, such as your own baths are content with:' or, again, if the Sinuessan baths were specially luxurious the poet would appeal to them as finding a rival in the baths of Etruscus: 'Sinuessa, you will find no bronze to carp at there, but only silver, as in your own baths.' At any rate *Temesea* is not certain.

I. 6 The following variants in this important poem are of interest 8 *ebriamque parten* 10 *uellaria borea.* This seems to point to *adorea*, possibly abl. 'rained with cake of victory.'

* The last *i* seems a later insertion.

11 *Hunc rorem* 15 *et quo precop* (altered into *q*) *nit aebosia* ·/
cannos (the ·/ is repeated in the right margin, but with no variant) 17 *gaioli lugunculi que* pointing clearly to *lucunculique* as Turnebus emended.

II. 1. 84

Tuque oro natura sinas cui prima per orbem
Iura animis †sancire datum
sancire Bod. *sanare* most MSS.

Heinsius conj. *sancire*, and it is obviously right. Here again the Bodl. codex seems to have preserved the right reading.

104 *Tu tamen et †ītittas etiam nunc murmure voces*
Vagitumque rudem fletusque infantis amabas

The corrupt *ītittas* points, I think, to *mutilas*, as Burmann conjectured. Cic. Orat. 32 *mutila quaedam et hiantia locuti sunt*, 178 *mutila quaedam et decurtata.*

222 *non ille †regauit*
non timuit meruitue mori

regauit Bod., not *rogauit*. Possibly *rigauit* 'whimpered,' as a boy might, at the thought of dying. But I know no instance of the word so used.

II. 3. 70

Idem auri facilis contemptor et optimus idem
†P^{r}*omere* (sic) *diuitias opibusque immittere lucem*

So Bod. *Promere* in spite of Gronovius' defence of *Comere* appears to me far more probable. It is only in much later Latin, e.g. Ausonius, that *comere* was used at all widely in the sense of adorning or setting off. And here the immediately following *opibusque immittere lucem* forms a sort of explanation of what Stat. meant by *Promere diuitias*. It was the character of Melior neither to make too much of his wealth, nor, on the other hand, to hide it from the public eye.

73 *Iliacos aequare senes et uincere persta*
Quos pater †helisia genitrix quos detulit annos

Elysio Domitius, rightly. Bährens' *Elysius*, whilst not accounting for the corruption *elisia helisia* of most MSS., also leaves *detulit* unexplained. The father and mother of Melior had (it would seem) died old, which is expressed by the words 'may you outlive the years with which your parents descended to Elysium.'

II. 4. 13, 14

Argutumque tuo stridentia limina cornu
Et †querelae iam sponte fores

querulae most MSS. rightly. Bährens' *tam* for *iam* seems to me spoilt by his changing *sponte* to *forte*. Might not *tam sponte* mean 'the door (of the parrot's cage) so over-ready to complain.' The bird was so fond of society and freedom that it was always knocking at the door in its eagerness to be let out. The grating noise which this caused would naturally suggest the plaining impatience of the bird: both ideas are combined in *querulae*.

II. 6. 8 *famulum †quia rerum omnia caeca*
Sic miscet fortuna manu nec pectora nouit
Sed famulum gemis ut se pium

I am dissatisfied with the ordinarily accepted emendation of *quia*, ascribed to Domitius, *quoniam*. The poet wrote, I believe, *quianam*. 'Ursus (*ut se* is a mistake for *Vrse*), it is a slave (O why is it that Fortune works such blind confusion in everything, and makes no distinction of soul from soul?), yet a slave true to thyself for whom thou mournest.' The sudden question, like the sudden exclamation, marks the style of Statius.

43 *simplexque †herrore decoro*
Crinis

Schrader conj. *errore*: but I think wrongly. *horrore* corresponds with the severe character of the slave's beauty as described just before *uirilis gratia, blandi seuero Igne oculi*. Moreover the combination *horrore decoro* recurs in the Thebais, II. 716.

48 *Nam pudor †nude notę †menti tranquillaque morum*
Temperies teneroque animus maturior aeuo
Carmine quo †potasse queam†?

48 unde note, *S. Gallensis seemingly.* mentis *most* MSS.
50 nota esse queant *Markland doubtfully.*

The best correction that I have seen of *unde* (*nude*) *notę*, is that of Heinsius and Markland, *ingenuae*. It does not however account for the *t*. The Bodl. codex might seem to suggest rather *ingenitus menti*, born in his soul: possibly *ingenitv*, was the origin of the corruption. In 50 Markland's conj. *nota esse* must seem, I think, impossible from Statius: both the elision and the neut. plural are alien to his style. The only word which occurs to me is *patuisse*: but it is unsatisfactory. The meaning, reading *queant* for *queam*, would be 'what verse can declare his inborn modesty, &c.?'

79 *carpsitque immitis adunca*
ora †uerenda manu

Surely *uerenda*, though given by Bod. and most MSS., is strange, as applied to the features of the slave. D'Orv. has *ferenda*, whence I conjecture *serena*: for as death approached Nemesis *oculisque nitorem Addidit et solito sublimius ora lenauit*, 74, 5.

III. 1. 19 *deus †attulit arces* (*artes* Bod.)
Erexitque suas

Bährens accepts Meursius' conj. *adfuit*. This however leaves *que* in an unsatisfactory position. I would write *extulit*: so Theb. XII. 730 *Vt uero aequoreus quercum Marathonida Theseus Extulit, erectae cuius crudelis in hostes Vmbra cadit.*

30 *Nec formidatus †uemtes ager*

So Bod., almost proving the correction *Nemees* to be right. Bährens reports *uenies* as representing most of the XVth cent. MSS. Again Bod. is a degree nearer to the truth.

46 *Hic templis †inscriptus auo gaudente sacerdos*
Paruus adhuc similisque tui

The word after *templis* is thus written in Bod. m. pr. *instr/pitº*. The erased letter has been altered to *i* and *pitº* to *pṭtº* (*pttus*). These indications appear to me to point to a different word, *inscalptus* or *insculptus*. The *i* of *pitus* is very significant, and could never have got into *inscriptus*.

116 *dixit mentemque reliquit*

mentem both Bod. and D'Orv. *montem* Bährens, without stating whence. That *mentem* is right is clear from three considerations. (1) Throughout Stat. contrasts the *litus*, where the little temple of Hercules was, with the *mons* above it adorned with stately edifices. (2) In *mentemque reliquit* he almost alludes to his former words 89, 90 *Erubuit risitque deus dilectaque Polli Corda subit.* As there he had entered the mind of Pollius, so here, with the conclusion of his address, he leaves it, passing, so to speak, out of the person of his worshipper. (3) It would not be true that Hercules left the *mountain*: for he was on the shore, where his temple and the company that could barely find accommodation in it, were.

IV. 5. 9 *Nunc cuncta †feris ueris† frondibus annuis*
Crinitur arbos

So Bod. If *ueris* is not right (and it sounds false to me, as to Bährens, who conj. *ueri*), the word may possibly be *fetis*.

V. 1. 181

Linquo (*Iniquo* Bod.) *equidem thalamos saluo tamen ordine †mostis*
Quod prior

Here I seem to unearth from Bod. the true reading, *mortis*. 'True, I leave the marriage-chamber, yet without violating the proper order of death, in that I do so before you.' Priscilla was considerably older than her husband.

219 *Is †color in uultu tantum crinesque genaeque*
Noctis habent

color of Bod. may be right against *dolor* of most MSS. 'So strange the hue his face wore;' with this would agree the

blackness, perhaps produced by sprinkling ashes, of his hair and cheeks.

232, 3 *hoc aere ceres hoc lucida gnosis*
Illo maia †colo uenus hoc non improba saxo

colo is apparently a mere depravation of *tolo* of other MSS., i.e. *tholo.*

V. 2. 64

Nec genitor iuxta fatis namque haustus iniquis
†Occidio et geminam prolem sine praeside linquens

Occidit et most MSS. The reading of Domitius *heu* is elegant, but can hardly be said to be supported by Bod. Yet *occiduo* which Bod. suggests is without parallel in Stat. It seems not absolutely certain that *occidit et* is wrong, *Occidit fatis haustus et linquens prolem sine praeside* 'without a protector.'

81 *Infestare libet manes †mertioque precatu*
Pacem auferre rogis
mertioque Bod. *meritoque* other MSS.

Is not *merito* wrong here? *precatu* can hardly mean 'imprecation,' and no *prayer* to the shade of the guilty mother could be called *deserved.* Some word seems required which explains or defines *precatu.* What word is uncertain: *maesto* or *merso* might be suggested: the latter might mean that the prayer was addressed to the world below, the realm of the dead.

140 sqq.

Quod si te magno (*magne* Bod.) *tellus frenata parenti*
Accipiat quantum ferus exultabit araxes
Quanta calidonios attollet gloria campos
Quom tibi longeuus referet trucis incola terrae
Hic suetus dare iura parens hoc cespite turmas
Adfari †uitę speculas castellaque longe
Aspicis ille dedit cinxitque haec moenia fossa
Belligeris haec dona deis haec tela dicauit
Cernis adhuc titulos hunc ipse uacantibus armis
Induit hunc (*huic* Bod.) *regi rapuit thoraca britanno*

For *uitae* or *uite* of MSS. Markland conj. *uigiles*, Bährens *uicis*. I hold it to be certain that a geographical name is concealed in it: probably *Vintae* or *Ventae*. Stat. is speaking of Britain; Ptolemy mentions two places called Οὔεντα, one in the territory of the Iceni, near Norwich (II. 3. 11), the other in the territory of the Belgae, Winchester or Venta Belgarum (II. 3. 13). It seems improbable that Stat. had any very distinct geographical idea of these two Ventas: more probably he took Venta as a typical British name. I need not remark that a similar vagueness attaches to the word *Caledonian*, by which I should suppose Stat. to mean nothing more distinct than the more northern part of Britain.

V. 3. 54 *non arua rigaret*
Sudor equm aut putri sonitum daret ungula †fossa

I believe Barth's explanation of *fossa* as 'loca ad equorum cursum effossa et comparata' to be substantially right. Just as the Greeks used σκάμμα of a prepared piece of ground, hollowed out and sanded for leaping, so *fossa* may well mean a place dug out and perhaps sanded for horse-races. Hesych. σκάμματα· ἀγῶνες στάδια.

85 *quis non in †funere cuncto†*
Eliadum ramos lacrimosaque germina dixit
Et frigium silicem atque ausum contraria phoebo
Carmina nec †fida gauisam pallada buxo

cuncto or *cunctos* (as Bährens reports from Poliziano) may be *ducto* or *ductos*, as in Manil. I. 867 *ob ducta* seems to lurk in *ob cuncta*. The former might mean 'who has not sung how the Heliades became poplar-boughs when the funeral-train (of Phaethon) was led on its way?': with *ductos* 'of the H. *assuming* boughs at their brother's death.' *lacrimosa germina* I explain of growths of amber-tears, something like Claudian's *germina cara maris* = pearls. *fida* I believe to be a relique of *bifida*.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Ant. 69, 70.

οὔτ' ἂν κελεύσαιμ' οὔτ' ἂν, εἰ θέλοις ἔτι
πράσσειν, ἐμοῦ γ' ἂν ἡδέως δρῴης μέτα.

THE only correct translation of these words is Seyffert's, *nor, were you willing to help me, would you enjoy it:* ἡδέως, that is to say, can mean nothing but ἡδέως σαυτῇ. But that Seyffert and Wecklein should think this rendering a defence of the text is strange. It is precisely the inaptness, not to say ineptitude, of this sentiment that drives most editors to make ἡδέως mean ἡδέως ἐμοί and to give the apt but inadmissible translation *nor, were you willing to help me, would I willingly suffer you.* Prof. Jebb supports this version with such examples as Ar. nub. 79 πῶς δῆτ' ἂν ἥδιστ' αὐτὸν ἐπεγείραιμι; i.e. ἥδιστ' αὐτῷ: examples which certainly demonstrate something. They demonstrate that when you have, for instance, δρᾷς τάδ' ἡδέως ἐμέ, then ἡδέως can mean either ἡδέως ἐμοί or ἡδέως σαυτῇ, which you will: naturally; for a transitive verb is related as closely to its object as to its subject, and so accordingly is any adverb which qualifies that verb: if any one has denied this, Mr Jebb refutes him. But to a substantive or pronoun attached by the link of a preposition the verb, and consequently its adverb too, is related much less nearly: the feasibility therefore, in the sentence ἐμοῦ γ' ἂν ἡδέως δρῴης μέτα, of supplying ἐμοί to the exclusion of σαυτῇ must be demonstrated, if at all, from other examples than these. Meanwhile I shall suspect that we are debating over a mere error for ἐμοῦ γ' ἂν ἵλεω δρῴης μέτα. Since ι had the sound

of η and Λ the look of Δ we should expect to find the scribes confounding these two words, nor do they disappoint us. At Aiax 1011 the Laurentian and its older apographs have ὅτῳ πάρα | μηδ' εὐτυχοῦντι μηδὲν ἵλεων γελᾶν, later MSS ἥδιον. In Eur. I. A. 1596 the words ἡδέως τε τοῦτ' ἐδέξατο καὶ πλοῦν οὔριον | δίδωσιν ἡμῖν will never perhaps regain their pristine form, but Weil's ἵλεως is a most specious correction of the initial cretic. In Eur. Bacch. 188 ἐπιλελήσμεθ' ἡδέων | γέροντες ὄντες sense is commonly restored by Milton's ἡδέως, and I would not set up my own conjecture against it; yet I am not at all sure that ἵλεωι is not really as near the MSS.

Ant. 437—440.

τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκ κακῶν πεφευγέναι
ἥδιστον, ἐς κακὸν δὲ τοὺς φίλους ἄγειν
ἀλγεινόν. ἀλλὰ πάντα ταῦθ' ἥσσω λαβεῖν
ἐμοὶ πέφυκε τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας.

But all these things are to me less worth winning than my own safety. All what things? Beside τὸ αὐτὸν ἐκ κακῶν πεφευγέναι, which is of course the same as ἡ ἐμὴ σωτηρία, mention has been made of one thing only; and what is that one thing? it is ἐς κακὸν τοὺς φίλους ἄγειν: all such things then as bringing one's friends to grief are less worth winning than one's own safety! This absurd result Prof. Jebb avoids by one road in his translation and in his commentary by another. In the commentary he paraphrases 'all such objects as the *safety* of friends'; but *safety* is just the reverse of ἐς κακὸν ἄγειν. In the translation this method is impracticable and he gives ''tis my nature to make all such things *of less account* than my own safety'. But this is a version which in the commentary Mr Jebb himself expressly condemns, for the sufficient reason that it is no proper rendering of ἥσσω λαβεῖν. Instead of a text which puts us to these shifts Mr Blaydes procures a simple sense by altering ταῦθ' to τἄλλ', which Nauck accepts and Mr Jebb calls attractive but palaeographically improbable. To this objection I will add that in Sophocles the phrase is always τἄλλα πάντα (Oed. Col. 609,

Phil. 610, 1442, El. 657, 741, Aiax 1398, though I think this last corrupt), not *πάντα τἄλλα*. Write the words in their usual order and it will give us that palaeographical probability which Mr Jebb requires: *ἀλλὰ τἄλλα πάνθ' ἥσσω λαβεῖν*: *τἄλλα* was lost in *ἀλλά* and a solicitous metrist then expanded *πάνθ'* to *πάντα ταῦθ'* without heeding the context.

I take this opportunity of emending a very similar error in Stob. ecl. I 4 2b p. 71 2 = Eur. frag. 299 Nauck ed. 1889:

πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην πάντα τἄλλ' ἔστ' ἀσθενῆ.

ἔστ' in this position is metrically inadmissible: see Elmsley Eur. Bacch. 246 and Nauck Euripideische Studien I pp. 46 sq. Write

πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην τἄλλ', ὅσ' ἔστιν, ἀσθενῆ.

οσ is absorbed in *εσ*, and scribes never care whether they write *ἔστιν* or *ἔστ'*: this leaves *τἄλλ' ἔστ'*, and some one inserts *πάντα* to make a senarius. *πάνθ' ὅσ' ἔστιν* I should think hardly so probable.

Ant. 548.

καὶ τίς βίος μοι σοῦ λελειμμένῃ φίλος;

When Sophocles had written the first five feet of this senarius, *how can I live without you*, he had written a vigorous sentence adequate to the situation: compare 566 *τί γὰρ μόνῃ μοι τῆσδ' ἄτερ βιώσιμον;* One iambus was lacking, and his native language proffered him iambic words in plenty to complete the verse without impairing its vigour. Who believes that he set them all aside and chose instead a word which enfeebles the sentiment to *how can I enjoy life without you?* Wecklein's *μόνῃ* and Hense's *μένει* are both of them words he might have used, and either of the two would easily merge in *-μένῃ* and leave a gap for the scribes to fill with this nerveless *φίλος*. But a simpler correction than either, surely the simplest possible, is *καὶ τίς βίος μοι σοῦ λελειμμένῃ, φίλη;* Misapprehended vocatives are a perennial fount of error in ancient MSS which do not employ our devices of punctuation: I take two kindred instances from the Hippolytus: 199 *λέλυμαι*

μελέων ξύνδεσμα, φίλαι, corrupted to *φίλων,* and 364 sq. *ὀλοίμαν ἔγωγε πρὶν σᾶν, φίλα, | κατανύσαι φρενῶν,* to *σὰν φίλαν.*

Ant. 746.

ὦ μιαρὸν ἦθος καὶ γυναικὸς ὕστερον.

μιαρόν! what has Haemon said or done to earn this epithet? 'O dastard nature' Jebb; but this is no translation of *μιαρόν,* which means *bloody* or *filthy* or *ruffianly.* It is only the least self-respecting of disputants who can choose a term so openly devoid not merely of truth but of verisimilitude: pointless abuse of this sort hurts none but those who utter it, and no heat of anger will reconcile it with the lofty character of Creon. I propose to replace the word by *μάργον lustful* (Aesch. supp. 741, Eur. El. 1027), precisely the taunt which can most plausibly be levelled at a man who interferes with the course of justice to save the forfeit life of his affianced bride. And sure enough it is this reproach that Haemon in the next verse repels with *οὔ τἂν ἕλοις ἥσσω γε τῶν αἰσχρῶν ἐμέ.* MAPION is the halfway-house between the two readings[1].

Ant. 1019—1022.

κᾆτ' οὐ δέχονται θυστάδας λιτὰς ἔτι
θεοὶ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲ μηρίων φλόγα,
οὐδ' ὄρνις εὐσήμους ἀπορροιβδεῖ βοὰς
ἀνδροφθόρου βεβρῶτες αἵματος λίπος.

ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑνικοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ πληθυντικὸν μετέβη says the scholiast; and really that is all there is to say about *ὄρνις ἀπορροιβδεῖ βεβρῶτες*: succeeding commentators can add nothing, no palliation, no parallel; unless any easy-tempered reader will accept for parallel the common and regular correlation of *ὅστις* with *οὗτοι,* or *οὐδέν πω κακόν γ' ἀπώλετο | ἀλλ' εὖ περιστέλλουσιν αὐτὰ δαίμονες,* or *ὡς ὥρα πάντα μὲν ἄνδρα σβεννύντα τὸ πῦρ, δυναμένους δὲ οὐκέτι καταλαβεῖν.* And

[1] Prof. Palmer in Hermathena vol. VI pp. 291 sq. brings the same objection against *μιαρόν,* and adds that no other senarius in this play begins with a dactyl or anapaest. He proposes *μωρόν* (*μῶρον*).

then the form *βεβρῶτες*? It is true, as shewn by Mr Rutherford at Babrius 33 3, that even the comedians abused the analogy of *ἑστώς* by figments no less absurd than *βεβρώς* for *βεβρωκώς*; but each supposed example, and more especially a *ἅπαξ εἰρημένον* like this, must be narrowly scanned, and here any doubt which may be kindled by the metaplasm will hardly be quenched by the false concord. The joint force of the suspicions converging on this word from the diverse quarters of accidence and syntax every one will measure for himself: I am led to guess that the original was *οὐδ' ὄρνε' εὐσήμους ἀπορροιβδεῖ βοὰς | ἀνδροφθόρου βεβρωκόθ' αἵματος λίπος*: Mr Blaydes has already conjectured *ὄρνε'*. Let the one *ε* absorb the other, the remnant *ὄρν'* would most readily suggest *ὄρνις*: *βεβρωκϵϹ* for *βεβρωκΟΘ* is a short step on the road of error and *βεβρῶτες* an unlucky effort to retrace it. *ὄρνεον*, though not found in the tragic texts, is at once Attic and poetical, and Dr Verrall's restitution of *τέθνηκεν οἷσπερ ὀρνέοις θνήσκειν καλόν* to Aesch. sept. 1011 on the strength of the scholion appears to have high probability.

Oed. tyr. 216—218.

αἰτεῖς· ἃ δ' αἰτεῖς, τἄμ' ἐὰν θέλῃς ἔπη
κλύων δέχεσθαι τῇ νόσῳ θ' ὑπηρετεῖν,
ἀλκὴν λάβοις ἂν κἀνακούφισιν κακῶν.

Because in English we sometimes speak of ministering to a sickness when we mean the very opposite, fighting the sickness and ministering to the sick man, it does not follow that the Greeks were equally inaccurate. Latin examples are to be found, though not many; and all that I have noted are post-Augustan, as Stat. Achill. II 444 'auxiliantia morbis | gramina', for it is on other grounds improbable that Horace wrote 'podagram' at epist. I 2 52. But in Greek it appears that the editors of Sophocles can find no parallel at all, since the single passage they adduce, El. 1306 *οὐ γὰρ ἂν καλῶς | ὑπηρετοίην τῷ παρόντι δαίμονι*, speaks of furthering a toward chance, not of mending a cross one. Prof. Jebb very fairly allows that according to common use *νόσῳ ὑπηρετεῖν* would mean to in-

dulge a malady, as in the *τῇ ἑαυτοῦ παρανομίᾳ προθύμως ἐξυπηρετῶν* which he quotes from Lysias. Nauck therefore writes *τῷ θεῷ* for *τῇ νόσῳ*; but the context points another way. Recall how often Sophocles likens a city to a ship: 694 *ἐμὰν γᾶν φίλαν ἐν πόνοις σαλεύουσαν κατ᾽ ὀρθὸν οὔρισας*, Ant. 163 *τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος ἀσφαλῶς θεοὶ | πολλῷ σάλῳ σείσαντες ὤρθωσαν πάλιν*, 994 *δι᾽ ὀρθῆς τήνδ᾽ ἐναυκλήρεις πόλιν*, Aiax 1082 *ταύτην νόμιζε τὴν πόλιν χρόνῳ ποτ᾽ ἂν | ἐξ οὐρίων δραμοῦσαν ἐς βυθὸν πεσεῖν*: compare in particular 22 sqq. of our play, *πόλις γὰρ...ἄγαν | ἤδη σαλεύει κἀνακουφίσαι κάρα | βυθῶν ἔτ᾽ οὐχ οἵα τε φοινίου σάλου*, with the *ἀνακούφισιν* of the passage we are now considering: does not the nautical metaphor of *ὑπηρετεῖν* invite the citizens to render aid neither *τῇ νόσῳ* nor *τῷ θεῷ* but to the *city? γῇ θ᾽ ὁμῶς ὑπηρετεῖν to serve your country with one accord.* One form of *ν* is *μ*, merely *μ* without its last stroke; the *ι* which with us is subscript is as often omitted as expressed in MSS earlier than 1200 A.D.: the error here then is *μοσωθ* for *θομωσ*, a transposition of letters; for the confusion of *γῇ* and *τῇ* is not worth mentioning.

Oed. tyr. 596—598.

νῦν πᾶσι χαίρω, νῦν με πᾶς ἀσπάζεται,
νῦν οἱ σέθεν χρῄζοντες αἰκάλλουσί με,
τὸ γὰρ τυχεῖν αὐτοὺς ἅπαν ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἔνι.

Nauck seems to be the only modern editor who retains this reading of the last verse, and he retains it only because it is not yet emended. Inferior MSS give *αὐτοῖσι πᾶν*: if this unscientific conjecture were made by a scholar of these days it would be despised as it deserves, but because it occurred to an unlettered scribe before the dawn of criticism it becomes the vulgate. The following strikes me as not only easier but more satisfactory: *τὸ γὰρ τυχεῖν σοῦ, τοῦθ᾽ ἅπαν ἐνταῦθ᾽ ἔνι their gaining your ear depends wholly on me:* compare Eur. Hipp. 328 *μεῖζον γὰρ ἢ σοῦ μὴ τυχεῖν τί μοι κακόν;* Aesch. supp. 161 *μὴ τυχοῦσαι θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων.* This resumptive use of *τοῦτο* has a good example in Trach. 458 *τὸ μὴ πυθέσθαι, τοῦτό μ᾽ ἀλγύνειεν ἄν.* Porson at Eur. Hec. 782 gives many

instances of *οσ* confused with *α*, and the similar corruption of *σο* is little less easy.

Oed. tyr. 1275—1279.

τοιαῦτ' ἐφυμνῶν πολλάκις τε κοὐχ ἅπαξ
ἤρασσ' ἐπαίρων βλέφαρα. φοίνιαι δ' ὁμοῦ
γλῆναι γένειʼ ἔτεγγον, οὐδ' ἀνίεσαν
φόνου μυδώσας σταγόνας, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ μέλας
ὄμβρος χάλαζά θ' αἱματοῦσσ' ἐτέγγετο.

The scholiast takes the object of *ἐπαίρων* to be *βλέφαρα*, which is unavoidable but absurd: modern editors mostly supply *περόνας* or *χεῖρα*, which is appropriate but impracticable. I will therefore propose without more ado *ἤρασσε περόναις βλέφαρα*: compare 1268 sqq. *ἀποσπάσας...περόνας...ἄρας ἔπαισεν ἄρθρα τῶν αὑτοῦ κύκλων*. If the termination *-αις* were represented by one or other of its abbreviations and so lost, the resultant *ηρασσεπερον* would be really the same thing as *ηρασσεπαιρων*; or this corruption may have taken place first and extruded *αις*; or *αις* may have been lost through its likeness, which in some handwritings would be very strong, to the following *βλε*.

I should like further to upbraid modern editors, or most of them, with the form in which they present 1279: *ὄμβρος χαλάζης αἱματοῦς* Wunder Wecklein Campbell Jebb, *ὄμβρος χαλάζης αἱμάτων* Schneidewin Nauck. You can say *ὄμβρος χαλάζης* for hail, the genitive defining the exact substance which you mean when you use the generic term *ὄμβρος*: you can say *ὄμβρος αἱματοῦς* or *χάλαζα αἱματοῦσσα* or *αἱμάτων* for a downpour of blood, the genitive or adjective defining the substance of which the so-called *ὄμβρος* or *χάλαζα* really consists: these things are credible in themselves and are proved by the examples which the editors adduce. But that when you have already defined the substance of the *ὄμβρος* as being *χάλαζα* you can then contradict yourself and define it anew as being not *χάλαζα* but *αἷμα*, this requires to be proved by examples which never have been adduced and I prophesy never will be.

Oed. tyr. 1349—1351.

ὄλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν, ὃς ἀπ' ἀγρίας πέδας
νομάδος ἐπιποδίας ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπό τε φόνου
ἔρυτο κἀνέσωσεν, οὐδὲν εἰς χάριν πράσσων.

The second half of the first verse has one syllable too many for a dochmiac, so the editors reject *ἀπ'*. This entails altering *ἔλαβέ μ'* to *ἔλυσ'* and *κἀνέσωσεν* with Campbell to *κἀνέσωσέ μ'*: these changes may be right, for the latter is very easy and the former has whatever authority attaches to an ancient correction *ἔλυσεν* in L. What cannot be right is to reject *ἀπ'* without making these changes and to say as Schneidewin and other German commentators do that *ἀπό* can be understood before *πέδας* from the *ἀπὸ φόνου* which follows. To prove this they quote 734 *Δελφῶν κἀπὸ Δαυλίας ἄγει*, and of course I could add twenty similar citations of equal irrelevance which would become pertinent if the passage on its trial were *πέδας μ' ἀπό τε φόνου ἔρυτο* or *πέδας ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπό τε φόνου*: but the would-be defenders of *πέδας ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπό τε φόνου ἔρυτο* must produce *Δελφῶν ἄγει κἀπὸ Δαυλίας φέρει*, which they cannot.

The next verse is still more difficult: here the first half has one syllable over dochmiac measure and the strophe leaves us doubtful whether or no the measure ought to be dochmiac. The answering verse 1330 appears in L as *ὁ κακὰ τελῶν τάδ' ἐμὰ πάθεα*, whence it is proposed to delete *ἐπιποδίας* here. But since there was no adequate motive for inserting that word it is more likely that each verse should consist of a brace of dochmiacs, though whether at 1330 the ancient correction in L *ὁ κακὰ κακὰ τελῶν ἐμὰ τάδ' ἐμὰ πάθεα* gives what Sophocles wrote must be quite uncertain. To restore a dochmiac in 1350 Elmsley alters *νομάδος*, which has no known meaning suitable to the place, into *νομάδ'*, which however has no suitable meaning either. I feel no doubt that Prof. Jebb's conjecture *μονάδ'* is correct so far as it goes; but I propose to reconstitute the passage with slighter changes than these four of *ὃς* for *ὃς ἀπ'*, *μονάδ'* for *νομάδος*, *ἔλυσ'* for *ἔλαβέ μ'* and *κἀνέσωσέ μ'* for *κἀνέσωσεν*; to wit as follows:

ὄλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν, ἀπ' ἀγρίας πέδας
μονάδ' ὃς ἐπὶ πόας ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπό τε φόνου
ἔρυτο κἀνέσωσεν.

ἐπὶ πόας, by which *μονάδα* gains a good deal to my fancy, is Prof. Campbell's: the alteration *ἐπιποδίας* was suggested I suppose by the scribe's knowledge of the story. When *μονάδ' ὅς* coalesced into *μονάδος* or *νομάδος* it of course became necessary to insert *ὅς* somewhere, and its most natural place was where we find it in the MS, at the beginning of the clause. If L's original reading of 1330 be retained and *ἐπιποδίας* ejected from 1350 I would still write the other words as above, *ἀπ' ἀγρίας πέδας | μονάδ' ὃς ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπό τε φόνου | ἔρυτο*, counting the last syllable of *φόνου* as long.

Aiax 784, 785.

ὦ δαΐα Τέκμησσα, δύσμορον γένος,
ὅρα μολοῦσα τόνδ' ὁποῖ' ἔπη θροεῖ.

The coryphaeus might call Tecmessa *δύσμορον Τελεύταντος γένος*: Teleutas himself perhaps might call her *δύσμορον γένος* without adding *ἐμόν*: but neither she nor any other person can be addressed as *γένος* except it be with a reference to her or his descent. Here there is no question of Tecmessa's ancestors or of any woe with which they have aught to do; and editors who quote Z 180 where the Chimaera is said to have been *θέϊον γένος οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων* prove that they are easily satisfied, but nothing else. Tecmessa is called unhappy because her husband is in peril of his life; no name therefore can suit her better than *δύσμορον λέχος unhappy wife*: she is *δύσμορος νύμφη* at 894 and *λέχος δουριάλωτον* at 211. The exchange of *λέχος* and *γένος* is not difficult and in fact occurs at other places: I have noted down Eur. Or. 1154 where the MSS are divided between the two: in O. t. 1364 *ὁμογενής* seems just defensible but Meineke's *ὁμολεχής* right.

Aiax 795—802.

ΑΓ. *ἐκεῖνον εἴργειν Τεῦκρος ἐξεφίεται* 795
σκηνῆς ὕπαυλον μηδ' ἀφιέναι μόνον.

ΤΕΚ. ποῦ δ' ἐστὶ Τεῦκρος, κἀπὶ τῷ λέγει τάδε;
ΑΓ. πάρεστ' ἐκεῖνος ἄρτι· τήνδε δ' ἔξοδον
ὀλεθρίαν Αἴαντος ἐλπίζει φέρειν.
ΤΕΚ. οἴμοι τάλαινα, τοῦ ποτ' ἀνθρώπων μαθών;
ΑΓ. τοῦ Θεστορείου μάντεως, καθ' ἡμέραν
τὴν νῦν, ὅτ' αὐτῷ θάνατον ἢ βίον φέρει.

'Teucer gives charge to confine Aiax in the tent and let him not go forth *alone*'. But the messenger's first version of Teucer's charge at 741 contained no such limitation: there it was simply to let him not go forth, ἔνδοθεν στέγης | μὴ 'ξω παρήκειν πρὶν παρὼν αὐτὸς τύχοι: and that moreover was the charge given to Teucer by Calchas at 753, εἶρξαι κατ' ἦμαρ τοὐμφανὲς τὸ νῦν τόδε | Αἴανθ' ὑπὸ σκηναῖσι μηδ' ἀφέντ' ἐὰν. The spaced words are surely a plain fingerpost to the correction of our passage thus: ἐκεῖνον εἴργειν Τεῦκρος ἐξεφίεται | σκηνῆς ὕπαυλον μηδ' ἐὰν ἀφειμένον. Compare for additional confirmation Ant. 578 sq. εὖ δὲ τάσδε χρὴ | γυναῖκας εἶρξαι μηδ' ἐὰν ἀνειμένας[1]: the phrase recurs in another sense at Eur. El. 379 κράτιστον εἰκῇ ταῦτ' ἐὰν ἀφειμένα. εαναφει and αφιεναι have six letters in common out of seven.

I will not add another to the conjectures heaped on 799, but proceed to 801 sq. The MS reading now has few to defend it: it will apparently mean 'he heard it from Calchas this day, wherein it (ἡ ἔξοδος comes over from 798 to govern the verb) brings either death or life to Aiax', i.e. death if it takes place,

[1] Whether εἶρξαι or εἶλαι (ἷλαι) should here be read is not certain, but they come to the same thing: Hesych. εἰλλόμενον· εἰργόμενον. Αἰσχύλος Βασσάραις. I have given the passage after Dindorf's emendation as perfected by Madvig: the MS has ἐκ δὲ τᾶσδε χρὴ | γυναῖκας εἶναι τάσδε μηδ' ἀνειμένας. Certainly I cannot entertain a thought either of Engelmann's ἐκδέτας δὲ χρή, which in iambic dialogue ought at least to be ἐκδέτους, or of the old unscientific ἐκ δὲ τοῦδε χρή which is still the vulgate. 'Henceforth they must be women, and not range at large', as Prof. Jebb renders it, sounds very well till we look at the context, which proceeds φεύγουσι γάρ τοι χοἱ θρασεῖς, ὅταν πέλας | ἤδη τὸν Ἅιδην εἰσορῶσι τοῦ βίου, 'for verily even the bold seek to fly, when they see Death now closing on their life' (Jebb): this reflexion with its inferential particle is quite incoherent unless there has preceded a command to *imprison* the sisters; and even if μὴ ἀνειμένας εἶναι ('not to range at large') could by itself signify imprisonment, it certainly cannot when coordinated with γυναῖκας εἶναι, as if forsooth women were not women unless *imprisoned*.

life if it does not. This is incapably expressed: much better is the translation given of Jacobs' *τὴν νῦν ὃς αὐτῷ*, 'who announces death or life to Aiax this day'; only it does not appear that the translation is legitimate unless *φέρει* is altered as Nauck suggests to *θροεῖ* or the like: Prof. Jebb quotes Aesch. Pers. 279 *φέρει σαφές τι πρᾶγος*, and the immediate context here supplies a similar instance in 789 *φέρων* | *Αἴαντος ἡμῖν πρᾶξιν ἣν ἤλγησ' ἐγώ*: but *θάνατόν τινι φέρειν* would naturally and regularly mean something quite different. It must be generally felt that the sense we desire and expect is that which some inferior MSS regardless of metre procure by altering *ὅτ'* to *ἢ*, 'on this very day, which brings either death or life to Aiax'; and I propose to obtain it thus: *καθ' ἥλιον* | *τὸν νῦν, ὃς αὐτῷ κτλ.* This poetical use of *ἥλιος* for *ἡμέρα* recurs at Eur. El. 654 and Hel. 652, but is rare enough to invite the gloss which I suppose to have ousted the genuine word: the necessary change of *τὸν* to *τὴν* offered no difficulty, but to substitute *ἢ* for *ὃς* required more nerve, and *ὅτ'* served instead.

Aiax 1393—1399.

σὲ δ', ὦ γεραιοῦ σπέρμα Λαέρτου πατρὸς,
τάφου μὲν ὀκνῶ τοῦδ' ἐπιψαύειν ἐᾶν,
μὴ τῷ θανόντι τοῦτο δυσχερὲς ποιῶ· 1395
τὰ δ' ἄλλα καὶ ξύμπραττε, κεἴ τινα στρατοῦ
θέλεις κομίζειν, οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἕξομεν.
ἐγὼ δὲ τἄλλα πάντα πορσυνῶ· σὺ δὲ
ἀνὴρ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐσθλὸς ὢν ἐπίστασο.

'In the burial I am loth to let you have a hand lest I displease the dead; but in all else help us and welcome, and if you will bring any other man of the host we shall be nothing vexed'. Interpreted thus the lines 1396 sq. seem defensible: the presence of the hated Odysseus would outrage the dead, but if he cares to provide a representative in token of respect, well and good. Were it necessary to accept the version which against Sophoclean usage makes *κομίζειν* mean *bury* and so elicits the jocular sentiment 'if you like to bury any one else it

will not annoy us at all', then indeed we must concede to Schneidewin that the two verses are interpolated; and the interpolator was another Aristophanes. But to expel the lines involves further changes and appears as I said to be unnecessary if they are understood aright. With this preface then I go on to my present concern, the words *τἆλλα πάντα* in 1398. These words mean the burial; but in what a way do they come to mean it! *τὰ ἄλλα* in 1396 means *τὰ ἄλλα πλὴν τάφον τόνδε*: *τἆλλα πάντα* in 1398 means *τὰ ἄλλα πλὴν τὰ ἄλλα πλὴν τάφον τόνδε, everything except everything except the burial = the burial:* an admirably correct equation, I admit. Rauchenstein's *ταμὰ πάντα* and Schneidewin's *ταῦτα πάντα* are better than the text because anything is better, yet the former is little suitable and the latter not the easiest of changes: I should write *ἐγὼ δὲ τἀλλείποντα πορσυνῶ I will make good what lacks,* in support of which I will only remind the reader that *ει* compendiously written has been mistaken times out of number for *α*, and refer him to the words of Odysseus in 1378 sqq. *καὶ τὸν θανόντα τόνδε συνθάπτειν θέλω | καὶ ξυμπονεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ἐλλείπειν ὅσων | χρὴ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἀνδράσιν πονεῖν βροτούς*: the offer to *συνθάπτειν* is rejected in 1394, the offer to *ξυμπονεῖν* accepted in 1396, and here in 1398 is dispelled all fear of an *ἔλλειμμα*. And now that 1379 has helped to emend 1398 the latter in its turn shall help to emend 1380: *πονεῖν* after *ξυμπονεῖν* in the line above can hardly be right, and our *τἀλλείποντα πορσυνῶ* suggests *καὶ μηδὲν ἐλλείπειν ὅσων | χρὴ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἀνδράσιν πορεῖν βροτούς*: *ρ* like *μ* is easily confounded with *ν*.

El. 453—460.

αἰτοῦ δὲ προσπίτνουσα γῆθεν εὐμενῆ
ἡμῖν ἀρωγὸν αὐτὸν εἰς ἐχθροὺς μολεῖν,
καὶ παῖδ' Ὀρέστην ἐξ ὑπερτέρας χερὸς 455
ἐχθροῖσιν αὐτοῦ ζῶντ' ἐπεμβῆναι ποδί,
ὅπως τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτὸν ἀφνεωτέραις
χερσὶ στέφωμεν ἢ τὰ νῦν δωρούμεθα.
οἶμαι μὲν οὖν, οἶμαί τι κἀκείνῳ μέλον
πέμψαι τάδ' αὐτῇ δυσπρόσοπτ' ὀνείρατα. 460

In regard to the phrase *χερσὶ στέφωμεν αὐτὸν* a scruple is suggested by the fact that in the 17 other examples of *στέφειν* or *στεφανοῦν τινά τινι* which the tragic lexicons offer, Aesch. Eum. 44, Soph. El. 53, Ant. 431, Aiax 93, frag. 492 5, Eur. Baech. 81, 101, 106, 112, 177, 341, Alc. 759, Tro. 576, Hec. 128, frag. 282 24, 369 3, 530 2, the dative is always the dative of the material composing the *στέφος*. It is only when *στέφειν* takes another construction, as in Aesch. sept. 50 *μνημεῖα...πρὸς ἅρμα...χερσὶν ἔστεφον*, that we find *χερσίν* added. Now if anyone bearing in mind the *στέφωμεν* and *δωρούμεθα* of our passage will then remember these, Eur. Or. 117 *Ἑλένη σ' ἀδελφὴ ταῖσδε δωρεῖται χοαῖς*, 1321 sq. *τάφον | στέψασα καὶ σπείσασα νερτέροις χοάς*, Soph. El. 51 sqq. *τύμβον...λοιβαῖσι...στέψαντες*, 440 sq. *χοὰς...τῷδ' ἐπέστεφεν* and finally Ant. 431 *χοαῖσι τρισπόνδοισι τὸν νέκυν στέφει*, I shall be rather disappointed if he does not agree with me in restoring *ἀφνεωτέραις | χοαῖς στέφωμεν ἢ τανῦν δωρούμεθα*. There remains the question whether *ἀφνεός*, like most words which mean *rich*, *πλούσιος ὄλβιος dives beatus*, can have the sense *abundant* which is now required but for which the lexicons cite no earlier authority than Oppian: if not, I think we must read *ἀφθονωτέραις* or *ἀφθονεστέραις*: Aesch. frag. 72 has *ἀφθονεστέραν λίβα*. To assist the defender of *ἀφνεωτέραις χερσί* I will remind him that *ἀφνειᾶς χειρός* occurs in Pind. Ol. VII 1.

In 459 for *μέλον*, which is thought to mean *μέλον εἶναι*, read *μετόν*: *τι* then is the subject of *πέμψαι*: 'I think that this dream was sent by some cause in which he (as well as the powers to whom dreams belong) has a part'. There is one form of *τ* much like the λ which we commonly employ.

El. 537—541.

ἀλλ' ἀντ' ἀδελφοῦ δῆτα Μενέλεω κτανὼν
τἄμ', οὐκ ἔμελλεν τῶνδέ μοι δώσειν δίκην;
πότερον ἐκείνῳ παῖδες οὐκ ἦσαν διπλοῖ;
οἷς τῆσδε μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν θυήσκειν, πατρὸς
καὶ μητρὸς ὄντας, ἧς ὁ πλοῦς ὅδ' ἦν χάριν.

Professors Jebb and Campbell have no note on ἧς in 541, and of course it looks easy to English the sentence by 'being the children of the father and mother for whose sake the fleet sailed', because *whose* is English for ἧς and οἷν and ὧν alike. But the only proper translation is 'being the children of a father, and of the mother for whose sake' etc.: two reasons then are given why Menelaus' children should have been sacrificed rather than Iphigenia: they, unlike Iphigenia, were born of Helen, and they, unlike Iphigenia, had a father. The editors who have notes help us little. ἧς, says Wunder, is employed instead of ὧν 'cum inuidia quadam Helenae'. Grant that this was the aim in view: how easy to attain it. How easy *not* to write πατρός at all, but simply μητρὸς ὄντας ἧς. There is not one of us, οἳ νῦν βροτοί ἐσμεν ἐπιχθόνιοι, but could excite the desired 'inuidia' *without* violating a concord, *without* leaving πατρός to hang in the air sans grammar or meaning: was Sophocles so much our intellectual inferior that he could not?

When Nauck conjectures πάρος for πατρός he displays his customary acuteness: the two words are often confounded, as at Eur. H. f. 930, and the pleonasm μᾶλλον πάρος is very idiomatic: see for instance O. C. 418 sq. πάρος | τοὐμοῦ πόθου προὔθεντο τὴν τυραννίδα. But then with a lack of art which unhappily is no less habitual he goes on to eject the next verse; as if an interpolator, any more than Sophocles himself, would have written ἧς when he meant ὧν. All the change now wanted is the substitution of a breathing for an accent. ε before κ dwindles to an almost invisible volute at the head of the upright stroke and thus often vanishes altogether: hence ἐκ appears as κ́ and is taken for κ́ the abbreviation of καί: O. C. 792 ἐκ L, καί al. I should write therefore οὓς τῆσδε μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν θνήσκειν πάρος, | ἐκ μητρὸς ὄντας ἧς ὁ πλοῦς ὅδ' ἦν χάριν.

El. 708—711.

Βοιωτὸς ἄλλος, δέκατον ἐκπληρῶν ὄχον.
στάντες δ' ὅθ' αὐτοὺς οἱ τεταγμένοι βραβῆς
κλήρους ἔπηλαν καὶ κατέστησαν δίφρους,
χαλκῆς ὑπαὶ σάλπιγγος ᾔξαν.

I start from Wunder's correction, adopted I think by all modern editors except Prof. Campbell, *κλήρους* for the MS *κλήροις* in 710: this renders the sentence intelligible, and the construction *κλήρους ἔπηλαν αὐτούς* for *ἐκλήρωσαν αὐτούς*, harsh as it is, has yet parallels to defend it, though after all one may wonder with Mr Blaydes why the poet did not write *αὐτοῖς*. But there remains the stumbling-block of *ὅθ'*. It was Elmsley at Eur. I. T. 35 who first pointed out that *ὅθι* is not elsewhere employed in tragic dialogue, and that even in those parts of tragedy where it is employed it is never elided. Sophocles therefore if he wanted an adverb of that meaning would here have used *ἵν'*, which Nauck bravely sets in the text. He observes that Homer's MSS vary between *ὅθι* and *ἵνα* at Θ 83, δ 85, ζ 210; but in those places it seems reasonable to suppose that the rarer *ὅθι* is the original and *ἵνα* the substitute: here we must assume the reverse, which is not likely. Prof. Jebb proposes *ὅτ'*, i.e. *ὅτε* in the sense which it often has of *ἐπεί postquam;* and although the change of a common word into a strange one does not easily happen, yet here it is merely the change of one letter, and that is always possible. But Mr Jebb does not seem to perceive that this will involve a further alteration of *στάντες*, which is left pitiably naked when the adverb of place is taken away. I agree however that *ὅτε* was the poet's word; only *ὅθ'* is quite right and the mistake is elsewhere: *πάντες δ', ὅθ' ἁγνοὺς οἱ τεταγμένοι βραβῆς | κλήρους ἔπηλαν καὶ κατέστησαν δίφρους, | χαλκῆς ὑπαὶ σάλπιγγος ἦξαν, when the appointed judges had cast incorrupt lots.* The confusion of *π* with *στ* is very well known; the change of *αγνους* to *ατνους* was easy and the correction to *αυτους* certain: *ὅθ' ἁγνούς* explains the MS reading much better than would *ὅτ' αὐτοῖς*, better even than *ὅτ' αὐτούς*.

El. 930, 931.

οἴμοι τάλαινα· τοῦ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ποτ' ἦν
τὰ πολλὰ πατρὸς πρὸς τάφον κτερίσματα;

'*τάφον* and not *τάφῳ*, since *κτερίσματα* implies *προσφοραὶ κτερισμάτων*' writes Prof. Jebb, and compares, I do not know

why, *ἀπαγγέλλειν πρός τινα*: similarly Prof. Campbell 'the accusative, because of the notion of bringing implied in *κτερίσματα*'. Words will imply a good deal when our exigencies require it of them; but the notion of bringing which we now discover to be resident in *κτερίσματα* would have remained unthought-of to the end of time had not this passage put the spur to our wits. If Sophocles could and would use acc. for dat. in this way it is really impossible to say why he refrained from using it in fifty other places, *φῦλον θακεῖ πρὸς Παλλάδος διπλοῦς ναούς* ('*ναούς* and not *ναοῖς*, since *θακεῖ* implies *προσελήλυθεν*'), *νηλέα γένεθλα πρὸς πέδον κεῖται* ('the accusative, because of the notion of falling implied in *κεῖται*'), etc., etc.: for a writer in verse the convenience of two strings to his bow is exceedingly obvious: yet the only parallel these dramas offer is the corrupt and unmetrical line Phil. 23. Mr Blaydes therefore writes *τάφῳ*, which is regular and simple; but no scribe would intentionally alter this to *τάφον*, and the change is not one of those which easily occur by accident. Comparing 894 sq. *νεορρύτους | πηγὰς γάλακτος* and 901 *νεώρη βόστρυχον τετμημένον* I think the sense would receive a welcome though not necessary addition if one wrote *τὰ πολλὰ πατρὸς πρόσφατα κτερίσματα*, or perhaps rather *πρόσφατον*. Adverbs of time, *νῦν πρὶν τότε πάλαι ἀρτίως νεωστί*, are freely used with the article in lieu of adjectives, and *πρόσφατον* is an adverb at Pind. Pyth. IV fin. *πρόσφατον Θήβᾳ ξενωθείς*. In O. t. 668 Nauck restores metrical correspondence and a familiar antithesis by writing *τάδ' εἰ κακοῖς κακὰ προσάψει τοῖς πάλαι τὰ πρόσφατα*, but there too the MS reading *προσφῶιν* seems to indicate *πρόσφατον*. But whether it was *φατ̀* (*φατον*) or *φατ̄* (*φατα*) that the scribe mistook for *τάφον*, either way the change was easy: I gave in vol. XVI of this Journal, p. 261, many instances from this Laurentian MS of three letters reversed, to which I will here add O. C. 1105 τόδε for δότε, Trach. 810 *προὔλαβες* for *προὔβαλες*, Phil. 423 *κἀξεκήρυξε* for *κάκ' ἐξήρυκε* and 1416 *κατηρετύσων* for *κατερητύσων*: at O. t. 1350 we have already met νομάδος for μονάδ' ὅς.

I hesitate however between this and *πρὸς τάφοις*, a slighter change than *τάφῳ*: the use of the plural is common.

El. 1466, 1467.

ὦ Ζεῦ, δέδορκα φάσμ' ἄνευ φθόνου μὲν εὖ
πεπτωκός· εἰ δ' ἔπεστι νέμεσις, οὐ λέγω.

I have given 1466 with Tyrwhitt's exquisite emendation of *εὖ* for *οὐ*, accepted by Musgrave Brunck Matthiae Wunder and Blaydes: 'uideo spectaculum felici casu (modo absit inuidia uerbo) oblatum: at, si Nemesis insequatur, non dico' as Musgrave renders it. Jebb and Campbell retain the MS lection; Nauck Mekler and Wecklein prefer Gomperz's *ἄνευ θεοῦ μὲν οὐ* which Nauck, always civil to Gomperz, calls 'treffliche': my present concern is with a point independent of this question, so I will only observe that both readings are confuted by the presence of *μέν*, for in both of them the sentence *εἰ δ' ἔπεστι νέμεσις οὐ λέγω* must be regarded as an afterthought and therefore cannot have had its way prepared before its face by that particle. What occupies me now is the phrase *φάσμα πεπτωκός*. Whether *πεπτωκός* means *fallen* like a cast of the dice or *fallen* like a dead body, in neither sense is it applicable to *φάσμα a spectacle: φάσμα πεφηνός* as Nauck suggests would serve, and so would *φάσμα πεσόντος*: but as for *a fallen sight*, there is no such thing. Better however than a violent change in the one word is a slight change in the other: *ὦ Ζεῦ, δέδορκα σφάλμ' ἄνευ φθόνου μὲν εὖ* (or *οὐ* or *θεοῦ μὲν οὐ* if you will) *πεπτωκός*. *σφάλμα an overthrow* here means *one overthrown*, as *πτῶμα* and *πέσημα* mean *one fallen*. Λ dropping out after Λ left *σφάμ'*, no word; and I presume *δέδορκα* suggested the transposition of *σ* which gives *φάσμ'*. These errors are similar: Aiax 292 *αἰβά* for *βαιά*, 1243 *ἤρκεσεν* for *ἤρεσκεν*, Ant. 452 *οἵ τούσδ'* for *τοιούσδ'*, O. C. 1742 *βουλόμεθ'* for *μολούμεθ'*, Phil. 701 *ἔρπει* for *εἶρπε*, Aesch. supp. 22 *ἱεροστέπτοισι* for *ἐριοστέπτοισι*, Eur. Med. 138 *ἐπεί* for *εἰπέ*, Bacch. 817 *θέλῃς* for *ἔλθῃς*, Ion 651 *ἐλθών* for *θέλω*, Alc. 1089 *χηρεύεισ* for *χηρεύσει*, Andr. 290 *δολίοις* for *αἰόλοις*, frag. 187 2 *παρειάσει* for *παρεὶς ἐᾷ*, 593 2 *ῥόμβῳ* and *ὄμβρῳ*, 835 3 *τις ἀνήρ* for *πονηρά*, Ar. pax 415 *ἁρματωλίας* for *ἁμαρτωλίας*: *καινός* and *ἱκανός* are interchanged more than once.

σφάγμα a sacrifice is also possible: the word is not found, but compare the compound *πρόσφαγμα* and the similar use of *θῦμα*.

Trach. 141—146.

πεπυσμένη μὲν, ὡς ἀπεικάσαι, πάρει
πάθημα τοὐμόν· ὡς δ' ἐγὼ θυμοφθορῶ,
μήτ' ἐκμάθοις παθοῦσα, νῦν τ' ἄπειρος εἶ.
τὸ γὰρ νεάζον ἐν τοιοῖσδε βόσκεται
χώροισιν αὑτοῦ, καί νιν οὐ θάλπος θεοῦ 145
οὐδ' ὄμβρος οὐδὲ πνευμάτων οὐδὲν κλονεῖ.

The two reasons for which most editors esteem 145 corrupt are, first, the lack of any relative to answer *τοιοῖσδε*, a void which is filled after a fashion by understanding *ἐν οἷς ἄπειρόν ἐστι* from what has gone before; secondly the phrase *χώροισιν αὑτοῦ*, which apparently if it meant anything would mean 'districts of itself' but has to be translated 'places of its own'. The first difficulty vanishes at Musgrave's change, which is no change, of *χώροισιν* to *χώροις ἵν'*: the second has been assailed with many conjectures of no diplomatic probability such as Wunder's *ἵν' αὐαίνοντος* and Blaydes' *ἵν' οὐ ψῦχός νιν*. I offer *ἐν τοιοῖσδε βόσκεται | χώροις, ἵν' οὐκ αὐγαί νιν, οὐ θάλπος θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.*: *αὐγαὶ θεοῦ* is just the *ἀκτῖνες* of Homer ε 479 *τοὺς μὲν ἄρ' οὔτ' ἀνέμων διάει μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων | οὔτε ποτ' ἠέλιος φαέθων ἀκτῖσιν ἔβαλλεν | οὔτ' ὄμβρος περάασκε διαμπερές*. The likeness of Γ to Τ often turns *αὐγή* into *αὐτή* as at Phil. 1199: then *ουκ-αυτ-αι* and *αυτ-ουκ-αι* are the same syllables with their order changed. These errors are strange, but they happen: Eur. I. A. 694 *συν-ισχ-άν-ει* and *συν-αν-ίσχ-ει*, Ar. Lys. 332 *στιγ-μα-τίαις* and *μα-στιγ-ίαις*, Hom. N 78 *δὲ πο-σσίν* and *πό-δε-σσιν*, Thuc. v 115 4 *χρή-σι-μα* for *χρή-μα-σι-ν*, Aeschin. Tim. § 35 *ἀν-ηκ-έστ-ως* for *ἀν-εστ-ηκ-ώς*, Ael. nat. an. XIV 25 *λου-σί-ρῳ* for *σι-λού-ρῳ*: I have given some kindred blunders from Latin MSS in the Classical Review vol. III p. 201 and the Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society vol. III p. 146.

Trach. 232—235.

ΔΗΙ. *ὦ φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, πρῶθ' ἃ πρῶτα βούλομαι*
δίδαξον, εἰ ζῶνθ' Ἡρακλῆ προσδέξομαι.
ΛΙΧ. *ἔγωγέ τοί σφ' ἔλειπον ἰσχύοντά τε*
καὶ ζῶντα καὶ θάλλοντα κοὐ νόσῳ βαρύν.

Tell me, says Deianira, *will Heracles come home alive?* and she receives the answer *Well, I left him strong and alive and hale and free from sickness.* At what a place in this enumeration does *alive* occur! If Lichas had said at the outset that Heracles was alive, his listener might well care to hear further, as from the messenger who in 182 sq. says *καὶ ζῶντ' ἐπίστω καὶ κρατοῦντα κἀκ μάχης | ἄγοντ' ἀπαρχάς*, that he was not only alive but hearty; but after hearing that a man is *ἰσχύων* one scarcely craves to be told that he is *ζῶν*. No support to such a derangement of epithets can be sought from *οὐ νόσῳ βαρύν* at the end, for that is merely the figure of rhetoric, occurring *πολλάκις τε κοὐχ ἅπαξ*, which repeats for emphasis in a negative form what has already been said in the affirmative. Wunder's excuse is that 'gratum quid facturus Deianirae quam plurimis uerbis saluum esse Herculem affirmat; quod cum faciat *παθητικῶς*, nihil fere attinet quo ordine singula proponantur'; Schneidewin thinks the offence diminished by the fact that the words are an answer to *δίδαξον εἰ ζῶντα προσδέξομαι*, a fact which to me on the other hand seems to concentrate attention on the fault; Campbell refers to instances of 'natural sequence inverted' such as Ant. 281 *ἄνους τε καὶ γέρων ἅμα* but to no example where the first epithet says all that is said in the second and a great deal more into the bargain.

Now in Aesch. Ag. 676 sq. this same MS to which we owe both Aeschylus and Sophocles has the words *εἰ δ' οὖν τις ἀκτὶς ἡλίου νιν ἱστορεῖ | καὶ ζῶντα καὶ βλέποντα*: Toup however, finding in Hesychius the gloss *χλωρόν τε καὶ βλέποντα· ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῶντα*, deduced thence the generally accepted inference that *χλωρόν τε* and not *καὶ ζῶντα* was what Aeschylus wrote. I find it hard not to believe that here likewise *χλωρόν τε καὶ*

θάλλοντα was written by Sophocles and corrupted by the evidently traditional gloss: certainly χλωρόν suits θάλλοντα well. Other causes may have had their share in the result: that ζῶντα stands overhead in Deianira's question; that καὶ ζῶντα begins v. 182; that ζῆν and θάλλειν are elsewhere coupled in more appropriate situations, as Eur. I. A. 1225 ζῶσάν τε καὶ θάλλουσαν and frag. 898 13 ζῇ τε καὶ θάλλει.

Trach. 575—577.

ἔσται φρενός σοι τοῦτο κηλητήριον
τῆς Ἡρακλείας, ὥστε μή τιν' εἰσιδὼν
στέρξει γυναῖκα κεῖνος ἀντὶ σοῦ πλέον.

If ὥστε μὴ στέρξει is Greek we may burn our grammars. We turn for help to the commentators, and they receive us, some with silence, others with profuse illustration of μή cum fut. indic. in *relative* clauses! Sophocles wrote μή τιν' εἰσιδών ποτε | στέρξῃ γυναῖκα. One form of π, as Badham somewhere says, is just ω with a lid to it, so that ϖοτε and ωστε have little to discriminate them: then the unmetrical ὥστε migrates to the only place in the verse which will receive it. According to Prof. Campbell στέρξῃ was actually the original reading of L; but the itacistic error is so common that this is not worth insisting on.

Phil. 348, 349.

ταῦτ', ὦ ξέν', οὕτως ἐννέποντες οὐ πολὺν
χρόνον μ' ἐπέσχον μή με ναυστολεῖν ταχύ.

You can withhold a man from sailing at once, and you can withhold him a long time from sailing; but how you are to withhold him a long time from sailing at once I cannot imagine: well may Nauck say 'ταχύ suspectum'. And the diction is of a piece with the sense: what sane writer repeats με in this way at two words' interval? Schneidewin can find no better parallel than O. C. 1278 ὡς μή μ' ἄτιμον, τοῦ θεοῦ γε προστάτην, | οὕτως ἀφῇ με: no one will cite Phil. 945 ὡς ἄνδρ' ἑλών μ' ἰσχυρὸν ἐκ βίας μ' ἄγει, for there the one με is object to the participle, the other to the verb, and moreover Suidas quotes the

verse without the former μ'[1]. It cancels both offences to write *οὐ πολὺν | χρόνον μ' ἐπέσχον μὴ νεναυστοληκέναι*, or *μὴ οὐ* if that is necessary: we have had *ρ* and *μ* confused already: after the detachment of *με* the further corruption at the end of the verse was partly due I suppose to the fact that there is no such word as *ναυστοληκέναι*, partly to the perils which environ whatever comes next the margin.

Phil. 424, 425.

κεῖνος γε πράσσει νῦν κακῶς, ἐπεὶ θανὼν
Ἀντίλοχος αὐτῷ φροῦδος, ὅσπερ ἦν γόνος.

The words *ὅσπερ ἦν γόνος* are almost universally regarded as corrupt: the sense *his son* is suitable enough, but the phrase is contemptible. The fourteen conjectures enumerated by Nauck are either slight changes which do no good or improvements obtained by violence; so I add my stone to the cairn. *ὅσπερ ἦν* differs from *ὃν σπείρει* in little but the position of *ν*: the trajection of a letter has been illustrated already at El. 1466, but examples more closely resembling this are Aesch. supp. 272 *λέγοι πρόσως* for *λέγοις πρόσω* and 417 *δοκεῖν δεῖ* for *δοκεῖ δεῖν*. The expression *Ἀντίλοχος αὐτῷ φροῦδος, ὃν σπείρει, γόνος*, pleonastic though it seems to us, is nevertheless very characteristic of the tragic style: Aiax 1172 *πατρὸς, ὅς σ' ἐγείνατο*, El. 261 *μητρὸς, ἥ μ' ἐγείνατο*, Eur. El. 964 *τὴν τεκοῦσαν, ἥ μ' ἐγείνατο*, Alc. 16 *ἥ σφ' ἔτικτε μητέρα*. The present tense of the verb is again idiomatic: O. t. 437 *τίς δέ μ' ἐκφύει βροτῶν;* Eur. H. f. 252 *οὓς Ἄρης σπείρει ποτέ*. Finally take a passage which tallies with this in both peculiarities: Eur. supp. 986 *Εὐάδνην, ἣν Ἴφις ἄναξ παῖδα φυτεύει*.

Phil. 606—609.

Ἕλενος, ὃν οὗτος νυκτὸς ἐξελθὼν μόνος,
ὁ πάντ' ἀκούων αἰσχρὰ καὶ λωβήτ' ἔπη,
δόλιος Ὀδυσσεὺς εἶλε δέσμιόν τ' ἄγων
ἔδειξ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἐς μέσον, θήραν καλήν.

After saying of a man that he is called by every term of

[1] I assume that the editors purposely refrain from quoting the exceptional and uncertain *ἰδού μ' ἀνατα-ράσσει εὐοῖ μ' ὁ κισσός* of Trach. 218 sq.

disgrace and contumely it is a very tame sequel and seriously impairs the force of what has been said to select a single term, by no means so disgraceful and contumelious as many another that could be thought of, and to call him by that, δόλιος. I should therefore reverse the letters ιο and write δόλοις Ὀδυσσεὺς εἶλε: ἑλεῖν δόλοις and δόλῳ recur at 948 and 1228 of the play. In this Journal vol. XVI p. 253 I gave examples of this transposition taken from the Laurentian MS, to which I add, as especially similar to the above, the following from other sources: Eur. supp. 925 ιοκλέους for οἰκλέους, Aesch. frag. 31 δαῖδας for διάδας, Ar. eccl. 288 ἐνδοὐμεναι for ἐνδυόμεναι.

This is all the change needed, so I make no more. It is however quite possible that what Sophocles really wrote was λόχοις: see Procl. chrest. p. 459 Ὀδυσσεὺς λοχήσας Ἕλενον λαμβάνει: at Rhes. 17 and 92 the MSS of Euripides vary between λόχος and δόλος.

Phil. 984, 985.

ἔμ', ὦ κακῶν κάκιστε καὶ τολμήστατε,
οἵδ' ἐκ βίας ἄξουσιν;

Not only are contracted forms of adjectives in -ήεις and -άεις (and -όεις except the feminine -οῦσσα[1]) unknown to tragic dialogue but according to Nauck no other example of -ήστατος for -ηέστατος occurs anywhere at all. Prof. Jebb quotes instances, not from tragedy, of -ησ- for -ησε-, and says that 'in O. T. 1279 it is almost certain that Soph. used αἱματόεις'; but if there is anything in what I have already written on that passage it is almost certain that Sophocles there used no form of that adjective except the legitimate αἱματοῦσσα, with which compare κεροῦσσα frag. 86 and Eur. frag. 857. How the portent came here I would propose to explain as follows. If ever there stood in a MS of Sophocles the verse ἔμ', ὦ κακῶν κάκιστε καὶ τολμηστέρας, a copyist encountering those words could hardly choose but see that the last was wrong. The contraction would not trouble him, but it would naturally strike him that this adjective side by side with κάκιστε ought to be vocative not genitive or accusative in case, masculine not

[1] πτεροῦντα is found in a suspected passage Aesch. supp. 1000.

feminine in gender, and superlative not comparative in degree: τολμήστατε instead of τολμηστέρας. He might not so readily perceive that all he had to do was duly to separate the letters and write ὦ κακῶν κάκιστε καὶ τόλμης τέρας.

I register without discussion a few more conjectures which seem to have either less certainty or necessity or moment than some of the foregoing.

O. t. 420 sqq. βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος οὐκ ἔσται [λιμὴν], | ποῖος Κιθαιρὼν οὐχὶ σύμφωνος τάχα, | ὅταν καταίσθῃ τὸν ὑμέναιον, ὃν δόμοις | ἄνορμον εἰσέπλευσας εὐπλοίας τυχών; write ὅταν καταίσθῃ τὸν λιμένα, τὸν ἐν δόμοις | ἄνορμον εἰσέπλευσας: hence came the meaningless λιμήν of 420. For the rhythm compare 826 μητρὸς ζυγῆναι καὶ πατέρα κατακτανεῖν, Eur. Bacch. 731 ἡ δ' ἀνεβόησεν· ὦ δρομάδες ἐμαὶ κύνες.

O. t. 602 οὔτ' ἂν μετ' ἄλλου δρῶντος ἂν τλαίην ποτέ: Heimsoeth writes δρᾶν τόδ', but δρῶν τόδ' suffices: see El. 943 τλῆναι δρῶσαν, Aesch. sept. 754 σπείρας ἔτλα.

O. t. 685 γᾶς προπονουμένας: perhaps πεπονημένας.

O. t. 866 sq. ὑψίποδες, οὐρανίαν | δι' αἰθέρα τεκνωθέντες: write οὐρανίᾳ 'ν | αἰθέρι, with ἀκρότατα γεῖσ' ἀναβᾶσ' | ἀπότομον ὤρουσεν in the antistrophe. ΔΙ seems to be a dittography of ΑΙ. I may remark that the ἀποτμοτάταν conjectured by K. Schnell in 876 and adopted by Wecklein is a form unexampled in tragedy and ought to be ἀποτμωτάταν.

O. t. 1031 τί δ' ἄλγος ἴσχοντ' ἐν καιροῖς < με > λαμβάνεις; for ἐν καιροῖς write εἰς χέρας.

O. t. 1242 sq. ἴετ' εὐθὺς πρὸς τὰ νυμφικὰ | λέχη: the conjecture εὐθύ is inadmissible: ἐς for πρός may be right, but so may εὐθὺς πρὸς τὰ νυμφίχ' ἵετο.

O. t. 1382 sq. τὸν ἀσεβῆ, τὸν ἐκ θεῶν | φανέντ' ἄναγνον καὶ γένους τοῦ Λαΐου: write τὸν εἰς θεοὺς...καὶ γένος τὸ Λαΐου: the whole corruption flowed from the error ἐκ for εις.

O. t. 1494 sq. τοιαῦτ' ὀνείδη λαμβάνων, ἃ τοῖς ἐμοῖς | γονεῦσιν ἔσται σφῷν θ' ὁμοῦ δηλήματα: write ἃ τοῖσιν οἷς | γόνοισιν ἔσται σφίν θ' ὁ. δ.: for σφιν see O. C. 1490: γόνοισιν has been proposed before.

O. t. 1505 sq. μή σφε παρίδῃς | πτωχὰς ἀνάνδρους ἐγγενεῖς ἀλωμένας: write μή σφε δὴ παρῇς.

Aiax 1100 λεῶν: there is no such word: write λεών. When Arcadius p. 94 4 says that τὰ εἰς ΩΣ Ἀττικὰ ὁμοτονοῦσιν ἐκείνοις ἀφ' ὧν ἐσχηματίσθησαν, ναὸς νεώς, λαὸς λεώς, he speaks only of nominatives: inflexions are not treated till p. 127 10.

Aiax 1310 sqq. ἐπεὶ καλόν μοι τοῦδ' ὑπερπονουμένῳ | θανεῖν προδήλως μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς σῆς [ὕπερ | γυναικὸς ἢ τοῦ σοῦ θ' ὁμαίμονος] λέγω: delete the bracketed words and for λέγω write γάλω.

El. 475 εἶσιν ἁ πρόμαντις Δίκα: this comes from μάντις in 473: write προμαθίς (Aesch. supp. 700) or προμαθής.

El. 800 sq. οὔτ' ἐμοῦ καταξίως | πράξειας οὔτε τοῦ πορεύσαντος ξένου: for οὔτε write οὔτ' ἄν, comparing for the postponement of ἄν Ant. 664: αν becomes αι and then ε.

El. 841 πάμψυχος ἀνάσσει: I and Nauck before me once proposed παμοῦχος: better perhaps δαμοῦχος.

El. 1327 πότερα παρ' οὐδὲν τοῦ βίου κήδεσθ' ἔτι; for παρ' perhaps γάρ.

El. 1394 νεακόνητον αἷμα χειροῖν ἔχων: χερὶ νεακονῆ μάχαιραν φέρων Heimsoeth after Heath: for the last word write νέμων, comparing the same error at Aesch. sept. 590.

Trach. 256 τὸν ἀγχιστῆρα τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους: perhaps ἐγχρωστῆρα: see Arist. eth. Nic. II 3 8 πάθος ἐγκεχρωσμένον τῷ βίῳ.

Phil. 83 sqq. νῦν δ' εἰς ἀναιδὲς ἡμέρας μέρος βραχὺ | δός μοι σεαυτὸν, κἄτα τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον | κέκλησο πάντων εὐσεβέστατος βροτῶν: for ἀναιδές write ὄνειδος, comparing κέκλησο 85 and 967 sq. μὴ παρῇς | σαυτοῦ βροτοῖς ὄνειδος.

Phil. 761 δύστηνε δῆτα διὰ πόνων πάντων φανείς: write δυσπόνων πόνων, comparing Ant. 1276 for the phrase and O. t. 1214 for the cacophony.

Phil. 1048 νῦν δ' ἑνὸς κρατῶ λόγου: the sense required is ἓν ἀρκέσω λέγων.

Phil. 1443 sq. ἡ γὰρ εὐσέβεια συνθνῄσκει βροτοῖς, | κἂν ζῶσι κἂν θάνωσιν, οὐκ ἀπόλλυται: if we might alter συνθνῄσκει to θρήσκοισιν it would save the next verse, which οὐ γὰρ ηὐσέβεια does not save.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

REMARKS ON THE VATICAN GLOSSARY 3321.

Professor Nettleship's notes on this glossary in vol. XIX of the Journal of Philology, pp. 113—128, 184—192, 290—295, contain many certain corrections: the following are a few places where I dissent from his proposals and have suggestions of my own to offer in their stead. What oftenest dissatisfies me with Mr Nettleship's conjectures is their failure to bring about a correspondence in meaning between the explanation and the word explained: here and there too I grudge the rather profuse hospitality with which new words are made welcome to the lexicons.

4 44 *absono absurdum uel prospero.* 'Read perhaps *absurdo uel aspero*' N. For *prospero* rather *praepostero.*

12 18 *aepas horientalis.* 'Read *eous*' N. Yes: but *aepas* is *aetas*, and these are the remnants of two glosses, <*aeon*> *aetas* and <*eous*> *orientalis*: compare 63 39 *aeon, aetas uel tempus*, followed by 40 *eous, lucifer.*

17 40 *angiportum androna uiformium uel callem.* 'Perhaps *angiportum callem. androna uirorum* [*aedes*]' N., rightly no doubt: *uiformium* however is not a corruption of *uirorum* but part of a third gloss, <*ancipitium*> *biformium.*

21 8 *aruas demonas.* 'Read *heroas*' N. Read *l-aruas*, comparing 105 5 *larualis demoniosus.*

22 22 *aufertice ablatiuus.* 'I can find no other instance of this bastard Greek term' N. It seems to be a mistake for *aferetice* = *ἀφαιρετική.*

29 37 *camba cauis.* 'Perhaps *cumba nauis*' N. One might also propose *gambae, calcis*; but nearer than either to the ductus litterarum is *corbula, corbis.*

51 1 *depalata denoluta designata delinita.* 'Probably *depalata denolata. designata delineata*' N. There can be no doubt that

the first gloss was what Mr Nettleship restores, *depălata, deuelata;* but the reason why the two are mixed up together is that the second was *depālata, designata, delimitata.* So in 51 2 *depopulatio desinatio* where Mr Nettleship says 'probably *dissignatio*' I would write *depālatio, designatio;* and in 53 11 *deuolato designato* where he proposes *deuelato dissignato* I suspect that we have once more the two glosses <*depălato*> *deuelato* and <*depālato*> *designato.*

53 12 *decoratio dehonestatio.* 'Read *decoriatio*' N. The explanation then is very euphemistic. Read *de-decoratio.*

61 35 *eligit affligit.* 'Read *elidit*' N. Read *fligit,* F for E.

62 24 *emptorium locus ubi negotiationes exercentur.* 'Add the word *emptorium* to the lexicons' N. I am afraid it is nothing but *emporium.*

63 7 *enhermis sine arma uel sine mensura.* 'Read *inermis sine armis. enormis sine mensura*' N. Read *enormis, sine norma uel sine mensura.*

65 29, 30 *erga id uacuum. egregium circa hoc.* 'Read *erga id, circa hoc. egregium magnum*' N. *uacuum* I suspect indicates a third gloss <*egenum*> *uacuum.*

65 41 *estidram quam ueteres canapum nominarunt.* 'Perhaps *oestrum* (or *asilum?*) *quem ueteres tabanum nominarunt*' N. Loewe prodrom. p. 403 amends *estidram* with more probability to *excetram* comparing gloss. Bodl. auct. t. II 24 *excreante* (=*excetra*) *plena malitia, hoc est ira* (=*hydra*) *quam ueteres canopum nominarunt:* see Mr Ellis in this Journal vol. XII pp. 259 sq. I conjecture that the one gloss is a decapitated form of the other and that *estidram* stands for *est hydra.*

65 47 *eutum sonum.* 'Perhaps *ἦχον*' N. Read *acc-entum,* comparing 5 40 *accentus, sonus.*

65 50 *euirat examinat.* 'Read probably *exarmat*' N. Read *euitat, exanimat.*

68 44 *exaceruabit aflecauit.* 'Perhaps *exacerbauit adflictauit*' N. These two words are very diverse in meaning: for the latter I offer *asperauit.*

68 46 *exercita exporrecta eleuata.* 'Read *exerta*' N. But as *exerta* does not mean *eleuata* we must make the further alteration *deuelata* or *reuelata.*

75 21 *feminalis pandi femoribus immoluti.* 'Read *feminales panni femoribus inuoluti*....The word *feminalis* should be added to the lexicons' N. It is no less easy to write *feminalia, panni f. i.;* and this entails no addition to the lexicons.

75 54 *fenium coccinum.* 'Probably for *minium*' N. The gloss is evidently identical with the *fenicum cocimum* of the Epinal glossary p. 9 col. A l. 34, for which Mr Nettleship in this Journal vol. XIV p. 37 proposed *phoeniceum coccinum.*

80 24 *fulcrum sustentatum.* 'Read *fultum*' N. It is a slighter change to retain *fulcrum* and write *sustenta-cu-lum.*

82 19 *gener initium foris.* 'Possibly *genae initium barbae*' N. Read *genesis, initium, fons:* in *genesisinitium* one *si* absorbed the other and *genes* then became *gener.*

85 42 *herosui uiri fortes.* 'Perhaps *heroes sunt u. f.*' N. I should write *neruosi uiri, fortes.*

86 48 *hiliesatus in silua natus.* 'Perhaps *siluisatus;* though I can find no instance of this word' N. *hiliesatus* is the same thing as *uilicsatus,* i.e. *siluaticus* with its elements in disorder.

94 17 *infusum destinatum.* 'Perhaps *infixum*' N. *destillatum* is a slighter change and produces a better accord between *γλῶσσα* and *γλώσσημα.*

94 22 *indutia utilitas.* 'Perhaps *industria*' N. Does *industria* mean *utilitas?* I propose *indusia, tunicas;* for *tunicas* and *utilitas* are the same thing.

94 26 *inertia stupor dentium.* 'Read *inedia*' N. If I remember right I have met this gloss elsewhere in the form which Mr Nettleship gives it; but that too must be corrupt. The phrase 'stupor dentium' is almost too absurd to exist, if it existed it could not mean 'inedia,' and if it did mean 'inedia' no one would dream of employing it to explain that word. I would write, following exactly the ductus litterarum, *a-mentia, stupor, delirium:* to read *ineptia* for the lemma would be no less easy, but the explanation would then be less accurate.

97 15 *inploratum inspiratum.* 'Perhaps for *inoptatum insperatum*' N. Accepting *insperatum* I propose *inopinatum,* which I imagine was first corrupted to *inoplratum* and then emended as we see by the transposition of *o.*

100 19 *inuado insecuro.* 'Probably for *insequor*' N. Read *in uado, in securo:* Ter. And. 845 etc.

103 21 *kategoriam dilatinominis.* 'a reads *delatatio*, which I would correct to *denotatio*' N. Read *delationem nominis.*

108 32 *licanus candidatio dicitur.* 'Perhaps *lychinus candelabrum d.*' N. Read *Libanus:* Augustine on psalm 72 16 'mons est *Libanus* excelsas arbores habens, et nomen ipsum interpretatur *candidatio.*'

109 27 *lisymmachus solutus uel litis.* 'Perhaps *lysimachus solutor litis*' N., which is clearly right so far as it goes; but read *solutor <belli> uel litis: uelli* absorbed *belli.*

113 17 *manda deceptio uel fraus.* 'Read *menda*' N. *menda* however means neither *deceptio* nor *fraus:* those words I suspect were an explanation of *manticulatio*, for *manticulare* is glossed as *decipere* and *fraudare:* see Lachmann Lucr. p. 108. Whether *manda* is a corruption of *manticulatio* or a fragment of another gloss is harder to say.

118 41 *modestare regere.* 'Add *modestare* to the lexicons' N. I would not venture: *r* and *st* are too much alike.

126 50 *nudi pedalia.* 'Read *nodi*, and add this use of *pedale* to the lexicons' N. This is a trifle precipitate: what we have here is merely the γλῶσσα *nudipedalia* without its γλώσσημα.

128 40 *obnixius humilissimus missus.* 'Perhaps *obnoxius humilissimus; obnixus nisus*' N. Rather *obnoxius, humilis, summissus.* The confusion of *obnoxius* and *obnixius* recurs at 129 15.

132 16 *oloser crini.* Mr Nettleship proposes *holoserica:* to me it looks like *olores, cycni.*

132 26 *omnitens omnipotens.* 'Perhaps *omnituens*' N. Read *omnit-en-ens.*

136 26 *papitans timens.* 'Read *palpitans*' N. Read *pauitans:* the explanation will then be correct.

143 23 *pix tracxit uelba marina.* 'Read *pistrices beluae marinae*' N. Read *piscatrix, belua marina:* the creature meant is the angler or sea devil described by Cicero n. d. II 49 125 and Oppian hal. II 86—98, τὸν βάτραχον τὸν ἁλιέα in Arist. hist. an. p. 620 B 11, the lophius piscatorius of modern zoologists, Pliny's 'rana quae in mari *piscatrix* uocatur.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

P. 156 45 *Quassum quomodo.* Read *quorsum.*

157 3 *Quapridem iam olim.* Perhaps *quam pridem quam olim.*

157 4 *Quamque versu qualibet ex parte.* Read *quoque versus.*

157 8 *Quapropter quodergo.* For *quodergo* read *quocirca.*

157 14 *Quantocuique quicumque de numero.* Read *quoto cuique, cuicumque;* Glossae *Abavus*, p. 384 23 of this volume.

157 17 *Quatenus qua ratio.* Read *qua ratione;* Glossae *Abavus*, p. 383 24.

157 26 *Quainqua parte in proqua.* Perhaps *quanam parte pro in qua* [*parte*].

157 41 *Quęstus lucra vel querellę.* Read *quaestus lucra*, [*questus*] *querellae.*

157 43 *Quae sententia quo consilio.* Read probably *quod consilium;* Aen. 1 237 *quae te, genitor, sententia vertit?*

157 50 *Quaerens quaerulans vel deprecans.* Probably *quaerens quaeritans, querens deprecans.*

158 1 *Quaeretat quis exitus.* Perhaps *quae ratio.*

158 10 *Querqueraest febris acris hac pesteque cum magno frigo solet venire.* For *hac pesteque* etc. read perhaps *hoc est* (*h. e.*) *pestis quae cum magno frigore solet venire.*

158 34 *Quin nisi aut immo.* Perhaps *quidni, quid nisi, aut immo.*

159 5 *Quia greco vocabulo atenas veteres dicitur.* Perhaps *quia* may stand for *Cecropia.*

159 8 *Quieverunt potuerunt.* Read *quiverunt.*

159 11 *Quisqualis quin potius.* Two glosses: *quis qualis, quin potius.*

159 25 *Quorsum in qua partem sive tegumenta.* Perhaps *quorsum in quam partem.* [*Coria*] *tegumenta.*

160 2 *Ramnus spinarum genus.* Read *rhamnus:* Gloss. Sang. p. 277 (Warren) and Warren's note.

160 5 *Rari mantes ritantes.* Probably *rari nantes, natantes* (Aen. 1 118).

160 20 *Ramosus calumniator.* I am in doubt between *famosus* and *clamosus.*

160 24 *Rafimenta interamenta.* For *rafimenta* the right reading may perhaps be *statumina,* or *statumenta,* though the latter word is not found in the lexicons.

160 26 *Ramnasia haec amatoribus.* Perhaps *Ramnusia virgo,* [*Nemesis: Ramnes, pri*]*ma tribus.*

160 40, 44 *Recusat, percurrit; recusat denuo tractat.* Perhaps *recenset* is right in both cases.

160 51 *Relucere resolvere aut lubere.* Probably *reluere resolvere aut liberare.*

160 52 *Refecerunt repleverunt.* Read *referserunt.*

161 3 *Reflavitur fovit resultat. Reluctatur contradicit vel expeditus discutit.* Read apparently *reflavit, iterum flavit. Resultat, reluctatur, contradicit.* Of *expeditus discutit* I can make nothing; perhaps [*resolutus*] *expeditus,* [*resolvit*] *discutit.*

161 7, 45 *Retilat, retelat, aperit vel demonstrat.* Read *revelat.*

161 20 *Rediredolet dolores spargit.* Probably *redire* [*regredi*]*: redolet odores spargit.*

161 29 *Refecit replet aut constippat.* Read *refercit.*

161 35 *Refendit rescendit aut demutat.* Perhaps *refingit* (or *diffingit*?) *rescindit* etc.

161 41 *Resedis requiescendo vel otiosus.* Read *resides requiescendo otiosos.*

162 5 *Relicina subrectat.* Perhaps *relicua subrelicta.*

162 28 *Remulcens replacans.* Probably *replicans,* the reference being to Aen. 11 812, *caudam remulcens.*

162 32 *Renidet splendet aut tollet.* For *tollet* read probably *fulget.*

162 38 *Repugula impedimentum adistus introitus vel retinacula.* Read *repagula* and *aditus* from *a* and *c*: and omit *vel.*

162 43 *Repens natans.* Perhaps *natans* stands for *natrix.*

162 45 *Respida redi ad te.* Read *resipisce;* the reference being probably to the end of Cicero's second Philippic.

162 51 *Reblat multa interpretatur.* Read *revelat.*

163 2 *Repulsus eradicatus.* Read *revulsus:* Gloss. Sang. p. 280 1 of this volume, *revulsit...eradicavit.*

164 4 *Religiosa graece anastasim dicitur.* Probably a confusion of two glosses, *religiosa* [*sancta* or *sacrata. Resurrectio*] *Graece anastasis dicitur.*

164 7 *Refectat reportat.* Read *revectat.*

164 9 *Riget friget an infrigidat.* Read *infrigidatur.*

164 21 *Rictus apertionis feria.* Probably for *apertio oris ferini.* Four lines below we have *rictus ferrarum oris apertio.*

164 47 *Roscida fluva.* Probably for *russea, fulva.*

164 49 *Robur virtus vel genus agni.* For *agni* read *ligni.*

165 2 *Rogrum lapsum.* Perhaps for *rubrum,* or *rubeum, flavum.*

165 3 *Rosa speciosa.* Read *rosea:* Gloss. Sang. p. 280 33 of this volume, *rosea pulcra.*

165 15 *Rufata gladii.* Read *ῥομφαία gladius.*

165 17 *Rupa ex utraque parte cavata.* Perhaps for [*spelunca,*] *rupe* etc. In line 37 below we have *rupe cavata, spelunca.*

165 27 *Ruscus spina longa iuncos habens.* For *iuncos* perhaps read *uncos.*

165 39 *Rudus lignum spinosum.* Read *rubus.*

165 40 *Riticum lignum cum foliis spinosis.* Read *ruscum:* so Glossae *Abavus,* p. 388 11.

166 4 *Salummersis profundo summersis.* Read *salo immersis.*

166 9 *Salebra loca cultosa.* Read *lutosa,* from Glossae *Abavus,* p. 388 32.

166 16 *Safarium atrium templi.* Read *sacrarium.*

166 24 *Sarga non idoneus cuiuslibet.* This gloss appears in l. 46 below in a fuller form, *sarga non idoneus civis libertatis,* and in Gloss. Sang. p. 281 of this volume, *sarga non idoneus cuiuslibet artis* (so c here, l. 46). Gloss. Epinal. p. 25 E 36 has *sarganan idoneus cuius libertatis:* the Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary edited by Hessels (S 95) *sarganen idoneus cuius liberum.*

Minton Warren, on the passage in the St Gallen glossary, quotes from the 'Glosses of Isidore' a fuller version, *non idoneus cuiuslibet artis professor;* but I am not sure whether this has sufficient authority. See Löwe, Prodromus p. 39. Warren accepts the gloss as it stands in that form, and refers it to the word *arga*, in modern German *arg*. Another possibility appears to me to be that *sarga* stands for *Sardus*, and that the reference is to the proverb *Sardi venales alius alio nequior* (Festus, p. 322 M.). Perhaps then we should read *Sardus, non idoneus civili libertati*. Another possibility is *servus, non idoneus civili libertati*.

166 32 *Saxira et utemilius intellegi possit acuminata*. Perhaps for [*scrupea*] *saxa nigra et cacuminata;* comp. 167 37 *scrupea saxa nigra*. Comp. Gloss. *Affatim*, p. 569 48 *stropea* (i.e. *scrupea*) *aspera prominentibus saxis cacuminata*. The words *ute milius* (= *uti melius*) *intellegi possit* must belong to another and a lost gloss.

166 34 *Sario sarculo*. After *sarculo* supply *laxo:* l. 45 below, *sari sarculo laxari*.

166 35 *Salacioribus velleribus gratis et asperis*. Read *solocioribus v. crassis e. a.*

166 37 *Sacro viscere pars est ingentibus proxima*. Perhaps *sacro viscere parte inguinibus proxima:* see Isid. 11 1 104 *viscus est pellis in qua testiculi sunt*, and the lexx. s. v. *viscus*.

166 46 See on l. 24 above.

166 47 *Sappapa qua sedule acidum vinum*. Gloss. Sang. p. 281 45 of this volume has *sapabapipa* (or *sapabappa*) *quasi dulco acitum vino*. I am inclined to conjecture *sapa vappa, quasi dulcacidum vinum*, taking *vappa* as an adjective, and translating *sapa vappa* as = weak or vapid must.

167 4 *Satis consequens*. Perhaps *competens:* the reference being to the phrase *satis esse alicui*, to be equal to, a match for.

167 7 *Satera iugum*. Read *statera*.

167 22 *Scaurosus asper*. Read *scabrosus:* and so in l. 27 below, *scaurum asperum vel nodosum*, read *scabrum*.

167 40 *Scita aut vel hanc rationem*. The original gloss may have referred to Aen. 2 105 *ardemus scitari et quaerere causas*. Perhaps then we should read *scitari causas*, [*quaerere*]

rationem: or possibly (referring to Aen. 2 114 *scitatum oracula*) *scitatum oracula, [quaerere]*.

167 41 *Scangere dolarae.* Probably for *stringere dolare.* Aen. 1 552 *stringere remos.*

167 43 *Scrubra vetusta.* Read *scrabra.*

168 13 *Scatabra* (i.e. *scatebra*) *emanantia.* Add the word *emanantia* to the lexicons.

168 29 *Sconna sponsus.* Probably a contamination of the *lemmata* of two glosses, *scurra* and *sponsus.*

168 32 *Scortum meretrix vel adulterium.* Probably for two glosses: *scortum meretrix, [scortatio] adulterium.*

168 44 *Scelerum furor parricidalis insania.* Read *scelerum furiae:* Aen. 3 331 *scelerum Furiis agitatus Orestes.*

168 48 *Scrufetarii viles atque contempti vel gratarii.* I can only suggest that two glosses have been confused: *struferctarii [qui quaedam sacrificia ad arbores fulguritas faciebant,* Paulus p. 295 M.]: *scrutarii, viles atque contempti.* Unless indeed *gratarii* hides the word *scrattae* or *scraptae:* see Löwe, Prodromus p. 281.

169 26 *Sensit intellexit aut paulatim.* Read *sensit intellexit; [sensim] paulatim.*

169 33 *Senipex equs vel cornipex.* Read *sonipes vel cornipes, equus.*

169 34 *Semnion monasterium.* Probably for *eremion.*

169 35 *Severus verticus vel iratus.* For *verticus* I propose *tetricus.*

169 41 *Secessio remoto loco.* Read *secessione,* or rather perhaps *secessu.*

169 43, 44 *Sero tarde vel aliter. Sequius aliquius vel longe.* Probably for *sero, tarde vel longe. [Secus] aliter. Sequius obliquius.*

169 50 *Septum apparatibus armis circumdata.* Read *saepta armis, apparatibus circumdata* (Aen. 1 506).

169 51 *Setres animos ignitatos.* Perhaps *acres animos incitatos.* Aen. 11 800 *convertere animos acres.*

169 53 *Serene vestiae latissime in mari.* Perhaps *Sirenes, bestiae latentes in mari.*

169 54 *Seclusa addita vel inclusa.* For *addita* read *abdita.*

170 2 *Seminatur vel pater.* Read *seminator pater.*

170 24 *Sevum sinistrum aut malum.* Read *scaevum.*

170 26 *Sebenites lapis persicus cuius candor cum luna crescit atque decrescit.* Read *selenites.*

170 47 *Sequius sermo.* Probably for *sectio est sermo,* as I have elsewhere suggested.

170 53 *Sere plane.* Probably *sane.*

171 5 *Sescitat interrogat.* Read *sciscitat.*

171 7 *Semota offectam vel seques*[*tratam*]. Perhaps *avectam.*

171 11 *Sfalangius musca venenosa.* Read *phalangius.*

171 15 *Sidus gladius.* Read ξίφος.

171 28 *Simires soni graves.* Perhaps *sonores.*

171 29 *Situs postio vel amor.* Read *situs positio:* [*sitis*] *amor.*

171 33 *Siqua fastim si quomodo patiatur.* Perhaps for *si qua fas sit, si quo modo* [*deus*] *patiatur.*

171 37 *Sidus gladius acutissimus resplendens.* Perhaps for ξίφος *gladius acutissimus:* [*Sirius sidus*] *resplendens;* comp. 172 5 *Sirdis* (i.e. *Sirius*) *sidus ardentissimus.*

171 42 *Sin quesi.* Read *quod si:* 172 7 *sino* (perhaps = *sin autem*) *quodsi.*

171 45 *Sistit statuit aut exilivit.* Perhaps *sistit statuit:* [*existit*] *exilivit.*

172 1 *Simotus lis inimicitiae vel contentio.* Read *simultas.*

172 3 *Sitra antiquitus.* Read *situs.*

172 13 *Synonima cognominabilia.* The word *cognominabilis* is apparently not known to the lexicons.

172 27 *Sititur statuitur.* Read *sistitur.*

172 36 *Si iure est si utile est.* Perhaps *si iuverit.*

172 37 *Sinus excelsum fluctibus* etc. Read (from p. 171 44) *sinus* [*litus*] *exessum fluctibus.*

172 45 *Sirenensis corruptio vel significationis.* For *sirenensis corruptio* read *syllempsis conceptio: conceptio* being the Latin equivalent of *syllempsis* in Diomedes p. 444 K., Priscian 2 p. 183, Donatus p. 397. *Conceptio* was first written *conreptio,* then *corruptio.* The words *vel significationis* may perhaps stand for [*verborum*] *vel significationis.*

173 23 *Sonores somno graves.* Read probably *soni graves.*

173 35 *Solvite corde pellite animos a timore.* Read *solvite corde metum* (Aen. 1 462) *pellite animo timorem:* Gloss. Vergilianae p. 464 24 of this volume.

173 38 *Sollemmituilit diem restituit.* Perhaps from two glosses, *sollemnia rettulit, restituit:* [*sollemnitatem*] *diem* [*festum*].

173 45 *Sospitantes sana verba.* Perhaps for *sospitantes urbem, sanam* [*reddentes*].

173 47 *Sodes fustes ab utraque partes acuti.* Read *sudes, parte.*

174 1 *Sodes sic vibas.* Read *si audes.*

174 4 *Sonix quus.* Read *sonipes equus.*

174 11 *Sortum coniugium.* If this does not stand for *sertum coniunctum*, we should perhaps read *comptum coniugium:* Lucr. 3 845 *comptu coniugioque.*

174 27 *Speratu fiala ingens.* Perhaps for two glosses: *sporta fiscella: sphaera pila ingens.* The latter gloss occurs below p. 175 11, and elsewhere.

174 48 *Specimen ingenium.* Perhaps *indicium:* so above l. 28.

174 49 *Spirantem secundi properati vel flati.* Read *spirate secundi;* and then perhaps *prosperate, feliciter flate.* Above, l. 33, for *speratesedicu prosperi fluentes*, read *spirate secundi, prosperi flate.*

175 6 *Spoliaria exteriores cellulae balnearum.* Add this use of *spoliarium* to the lexicons.

175 10 *Specifica pulchra vel speciosa.* Add *specificus* to the lexicons.

175 13 *Spiris voluminibus ex gyris.* For *ex* read *et.*

175 29 *Strambum qui unum oculum tortum habet. Strambum* is not to be changed to *strabum:* see Löwe, Prodromus, p. 391.

175 30 *Stronicis mimicis.* Read *histrionicis.*

175 31 *Stipasse condemnasse.* Read *condensasse.*

175 35 *Strangulat variat.* Perhaps for *strangulat* [*suffocat*]; (see Gloss. *Abavus* p. 393 38): *stragula* [*vestis, varia*].

175 38 *Sterclinia scopoliarum acervus.* For *scopoliarum* read perhaps *scubalorum.*

175 42 *Sterno exitia vel tinuatio.* Perhaps for *sterno, exitio do:* [*sternumentum*] *sternutatio.*

175 43 *Sterillum varba de crapra iocai.* Read *barba de capra vocatur,* with Löwe, Glossae Nominum, p. 138.

175 47 *Stipem modicitatem.* Add this instance of *modicitas* (= a small quantity) to those given by Georges.

176 7 *Stica tunica.* Read *serica.*

176 11 *Stropola inpostura.* Probably for *strophula,* diminutive of *stropha.*

176 12 *Strovam variatim et semet invicem continentes.* Perhaps *strophe, varia themata semet invicem continentia.*

176 19 *Stuporatus stupefactus.* Add this instance of *stuporatus* to that given by Georges.

176 40 *Stomo partus.* Perhaps *στόμα, portus.*

176 51 *Stipite arbor nudata foliis.* Read *arbore.*

177 12 *Sub divo in rore sub patenti caelo.* For *rore* perhaps read *rure.*

177 18 *Subdiu refugium vel certantes.* Perhaps for *sub diu,* [*patenti caelo*]. Then (from l. 45 below) [*subsidium*] *refugium vel tutamen.* For *certantes a* and *c* give *certamen* (= *tutamen*) here.

177 24 *Sublatum subtractum.* Probably *sublatum* stands for *sublectum.*

177 28 *Subpeditantia qua facultas subpeditat.* Add the word *suppeditantia* to the lexicons.

177 33 *Suspensus indubius vel inconstans.* Read *in dubio.*

177 36 *Suopte suo ipsius torridum.* Perhaps *suopte, suo ipsius:* [*succensum*] *torridum.*

177 40 *Succensor inflammator.* Add *succensor* to the lexicons.

177 44 *Subsciva subsequentia vel succendentia* (= *succedentia*) *vel dolosa.* This seems to point to a word *subsecivus* or *subsicivus* derived from *subsequor:* comp. Glos. *Abavus* p. 394 35 *subscivus malus interpres:* p. 179 12 below, *subseciva subsequentia vel succedania.*

177 47 *Sunt mici habeo.* Read *mihi.*

178 4 *Superis concessit.* The reference is to Aen. 2 91 *superis concessit ab oris.*

178 5 *Subobtentu proprio nutu.* Read *suo arbitratu.*

178 15 *Subrigat subsistit.* Perhaps *subrogat substituit.*

178 17 *Subrige caput humiliate.* Perhaps *subrige caput, humo leva te.*

178 26 *Succentaratur accingitur.* Read *succenturiatur.*

178 31 *Suffit subrogavit aut subsistit.* For *suffit* read (from *a* and *c*) *suffecit,* and for *subsistit, substituit.*

178 32 *Suffraginatus, praecisis auribus.* Add *suffraginatus* to the lexicons.

178 48 *Suburra sonus quolibet.* Read *susurrus, sonus quilibet.*

178 49 *Subia obsculatur.* Read *saviat osculatur,* or perhaps *ausculatur.*

178 50 *Sueviter suevit crudeliter.* Perhaps *saevitur, saevit: [saeviter,] crudeliter:* Gloss. *Abavus* p. 388 26, 27 *saeviter crudeliter: saevitur irascitur, feret* (i.e. *furit*).

179 13 *Suspito salto.* Read *sospito salvo.*

179 16 *Sublicius fons qui inter eius materie est aquas subliquitur.* Read *S. pons quia inter eius materiem aqua subliquitur* (see Festus p. 293 M.).

179 27 *Suppetitum refugium.* Read *suppetiatum.*

179 28 *Suppeo rogo vel inanimo.* Perhaps *supplico rogo: [sufflo] inanimo, inanimo* meaning to breathe into.

179 35 *Supex omnia utensilia domi.* Read *supellex.*

179 43 *Subsicivum semperracuum.* Read *supervacuum.*

179 45 *Submusim murmuranter vel timide.* Paulus p. 298 M. has a note on *summussus,* but the adverb *summussim* has not found its way into the lexicons.

180 1 *Suppara paulo minus quam pariam vel tunice que et subucule dicitur.* Perhaps *supparum paulo minus quam superaria, vel tunica quae et subucula dicitur.* For *superaria* see Contributions to Latin Lexicography, p. 592.

180 2 *Sudum serenum post pluviam dictum a sudore humoris vel quasi semiundum* (read *semiudum*) *vel siccum id est sine dubio.* For *sine dubio* read *sine udo,* and compare Nonius, p. 31.

180 6 *Supes suppinipes idest supinis pedibus.* Add this instance of *suppes* to the one quoted in the lexicons from Petronius.

180 7 *Sugitantes sollicitantes.* Read *subigitantes.*

180 10 *Sucula sadas grece virgilias.* Read *suculas Vergilias, graece hyadas.*

180 20 *Suspendio suspensio vel stranguilaticus.* Perhaps *suspendium suspensio.* [*Suspendio*] *strangulaticus. Suspendio* (masc.) would thus = a gallows-bird.

180 26 *Suspicienter veneraviliter.* Add the adverb *suspicienter* to the lexicons.

180 35 *Subcendia fomenta.* Add *succendium* to the lexicons.

180 36 *Supprestiti vibi.* Read *superstites vivi.*

180 40 *Subigunt augunt.* Read *acuunt.*

180 42 *Subservias subat vel quiescas.* Perhaps *subservias oboedias, adquiescas.*

(*To be continued.*)

H. NETTLESHIP.

CAESAR'S INVASION OF BRITAIN.

VERY briefly, in reply to Mr Ridgeway (*Journal of Philology*, vol. XIX. pp. 200 and seqq.). I plead guilty to omitting to mention that when Caesar first invaded Britain, Strabo was in the nursery according to Mr Ridgeway, or was not quite born, according to Clinton. I plead guilty to "slipping in" the word *mouth* in referring to the Rhine. I was not aware that people ever *put out to sea* (τοῖς ἀναγομένοις), "a glance at Stephanus or Liddell and Scott" will shew the meaning, from either the source of a river or even from the middle course thereof. That Greek vessels found in Kent came by the Rhine route has no bearing upon the question whatever.

That Strabo mentions something about the Veneti not derived from Caesar is no argument against his having misunderstood Caesar in another passage (p. 202). I still consider that the use of the word ἔτεινον shews that in this place ἀντὶ κάλων refers to rigging and not to cables.

My "method of textual criticism" (p. 204) was to ask a question about the practice of Greek Geographical MSS., in which I hoped Mr Ridgeway could enlighten me, which he has not answered directly.

With regard to the occupation by the Britons of the landing places opposite the continent (p. 206), I answer that Caesar did not avoid such places for such a reason; he landed in the teeth of a British army.

With regard to landing opposite the Great Wealden Forest (p. 206), Mr Ridgeway has I venture to think not considered what that forest was like. All that Caesar tells us is that there were woods in which the Britons took refuge. Well, there were woods everywhere; but Caesar does not lead us to believe that he landed in a place where his march inland was barred by an all but impenetrable forest, 30 to 40 miles wide, severing the tribes north and south of it into two peoples, still uninhabited for the most part eleven hundred years after Caesar's time, and so difficult of access that when William the Conqueror landed at Pevensey, though by that time there were Roman roads

made through it, he preferred to march eastward along the coast and turn the forest. Caesar gives us no hint of any such round about march towards the Thames.

With regard to "Mr Malden's way of getting his 55 miles" (p. 207), I may simply say that the way indicated is not mine. I got 55 miles by going to sea with my eyes open, observing long ago and more recently where in the straits or near them Britain could be described as *sub sinistra* and *relicta* from a ship crossing from Cape Grisnez. Then I measured the distance to off Pevensey Bay on a chart of the Channel. Why does Caesar say that he aimed at the part of the island *qua optimum esse egressum cognoverat* if he meant the part which he had judged to be most inconvenient (p. 207), and how did he make a landmark of cliffs 39 miles off?

It is not correct that I "avoid the question of the time occupied in the second voyage" (p. 207), I expressly stated it (pp. 198, 199), from soon after sunrise to a little before noon.

With regard to the pace of the transports (pp. 209, 210), I repeat that Caesar's pace was that of his slowest ships. In every combined movement the pace of the slowest regulates the collective speed, of necessity. Caesar tells us that by extraordinary exertions the landsmen on board the transports kept up with the ships of war. The inference is that the ships of war were not rowing beyond their ordinary pace. No zeal can enable a tub to keep pace with a racing boat when both are racing. Owing to the zeal of the soldiers *Vectoriis gravibusque navigiis* the men of war were not compelled,

> "The flapping sail hauled down, to halt for logs like these."

Mr Ridgeway is right in saying (p. 209), that the soldiers who rowed these ships are not to be compared in efficiency with the crew of a mediaeval galley; the latter, who also rowed in relays, were at all events taught their work and fed well enough to do it.

I am willing to doubt about the first port of embarkation, I am not doubtful that Caesar's account is incompatible with a landing at Pevensey.

HENRY ELLIOT MALDEN.

ST POLYCARP TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

THE *Journal of Philology* has done good service to the cause of patristic learning by publishing Mr Cotterill's article on St Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians*, namely in vol. XIX. 241—285. Portions of the *Epistle* are now known to have been overlooked in the *Homilies* of Antiochus[1], on which commentators are accustomed to draw largely for extracts from other early ecclesiastical writings. The writer goes on to compare the *Epistle* with the *Homilies* in a very thorough and suggestive way; and he comes to the novel conclusion that the *Epistle* was written, not by Polycarp but by Antiochus or "his copyist" (p. 274), the weight of evidence being "on the side of the theory that Antiochus was himself the author" (p. 285).

While I have learned much from Mr Cotterill's argument, I am not convinced of the soundness of his inferences. Before reading the article in question I had never paid much attention to the *Epistle* of Polycarp, but I had for some little time been engaged in the study of the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Zahn and Cotterill suggest that the *Epistle* was more or less inspired by the *Shepherd* (p. 249): it seems to me at least as likely that the author of the *Shepherd* borrowed from the *Epistle*. My purpose in writing is partly to state the case for this particular conclusion and partly to say something in reply to the new argument against the *Epistle*.

[1] See Migne *P. G.* tom. 89. The *Homilies* will be referred to either simply by number or with the addition of the column and subsection in Migne, as in note 3.

I. *Polycarp and Antiochus.*

The argument, after a short preamble, commences thus (p. 242): "Take, for example, the remarkable phrase in *Epist.* 6 'Knowing that we are all debtors of sins (*sic*).' The whole passage in which it occurs is in *Hom.* 123. But this particular phrase is found in the Book of Enoch &c." I find however in the *Epistle* εἰδότες ὅτι πάντες ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας, and in the *Homily* εἰδότες ὅτι ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτιῶν. Not to dwell upon the intrinsic difference of ἁμαρτίας and ἁμαρτιῶν and the significant word πάντες which we miss in the *Homilies*, I will merely illustrate the variation *sins* for *sin* by the saying in the Gospel, Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, compared with the liturgical phrase founded upon it, "...that takest away the sins of the world." As in this case the later writing has "sins" for "sin," so I should be prepared to find that the *Homily*, which reads ὀφειλέται ἁμαρτιῶν, is later than the *Epistle*, which reads ὀφειλέται ἁμαρτίας.

A few lines lower down (p. 242) an attempt is made to shew that Antiochus would not have quoted the *Epistle* if he had had it before him, thus: "Then again some explanation is needed of the fascination which the *Epistle* clearly had for Antiochus if he knew it at all. An interest in Dionysius the Areopagite, or Hermas, or Ignatius one can understand. There is a certain uniqueness in the writings of each of these authors. But Bishop Lightfoot remarks upon the *Epistle* of Polycarp that it is 'essentially commonplace,' and that 'it has intrinsically no literary or theological interest.' If the *Epistle* is genuine this judgment is most certainly true, and thus there is nothing in its contents to explain the lively interest in it which Antiochus must have felt if he had any knowledge of it at all."

Reasons will be given below for pronouncing this judgment not true: here let us consider briefly the force of the argument from the assumed character of the *Epistle*. Until recently it might have been urged against its genuineness that there was no trace of it in the *Homilies* of Antiochus, that

thesaurus of excerpts from other early ecclesiastical writings; and its defenders might have defended it by saying that it was not worth quoting. Now that much of the *Epistle* has been found in the *Homilies*, this defence is as impossible as it is unnecessary. On the other hand, I do not know on what principle it can be maintained by any opponent that the substance of the *Epistle* was good enough for Antiochus to compose partly as part of his *Homilies*, with the help of certain other earlier writings, and yet would not have been good enough for him to quote from the *Epistle* itself if this had been a primitive writing and Polycarp the author of it. Mr Cotterill's discovery is fatal to any form of the subjective hypothesis that Antiochus "would not" have quoted the *Epistle*.

But if the portions of it found in the *Homilies* were composed by the author of the *Homilies*, might we not expect that these portions would be homogeneous with the *Homilies*? The article seems to assume that they are not; and then adds in defence of the theory that Antiochus may nevertheless have been the author of the *Epistle* (p. 249), "This theory is not to be disposed of summarily as absurd on the ground of difference of style, for not only has every writer several styles, each of which is natural to him, but, if he has a real mastery over the language in which he writes, he can assume any style he wishes."

The longer parallels between the *Epistle* and the *Homilies* are set forth on pp. 246—9. I will first notice a portion of the extract from chap. 5 of the *Epistle*,

ᾧ ἐὰν εὐαρεστήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, ἀπολημψόμεθα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα, καθὼς ὑπέσχετο ἡμῖν ἐγεῖραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι, ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ, εἴγε πιστεύομεν. ὁμοίως καὶ νεώτεροι ἄμεμπτοι ἐν πᾶσιν, πρὸ παντὸς προνοοῦντες ἁγνείας καὶ χαλιναγωγοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, *ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται, καὶ οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν, οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα. διὸ δέον ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων, ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ὡς*

Θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ· τὰς παρθένους ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει περιπατεῖν.

εἴγε πιστεύομεν] "The words εἴγε πιστεύομεν should be observed. They are not in *Hom.* 123, where the words to which they are tacked on are found. They are not wanted, for the preceding ἀξίως includes them" (p. 260). On the contrary, a divine who insisted upon salvation by grace and οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων (*Epist.* 1) would naturally add such words as a corrective to his ἀξίως κ.τ.λ.: the phrase objected to has (I should say) the true Polycarpian ring. It would be natural also for the later writer Antiochus to omit it as not belonging to the text 2 Tim. ii. 12, the source of καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν. Nevertheless, putting together in the passage cited ἀπολησόμεθα καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα... εἴγε πιστεύομεν, we may compare from *Hom.* 1, "he that runneth by faith[2] below receiveth τὴν ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ" (p. 263), as probably an adaptation from the *Epistle*, embodying the rejected εἴγε πιστεύομεν.

χαλιναγωγοῦντες ἑαυτούς] Cf. St James iii. 2. There is no need to go to Hermas *Mand.* xii...τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν χαλιναγωγήσεις to explain or account for Polycarp's use of this phrase. Of the two works the *Shepherd* is certainly the more in need of explanation, and in this and other particulars, as I shall argue below, it may have been indebted to the *Epistle*.

τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ] "The language of Basil... adding Col. iii. 5 νεκρώσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κ.τ.λ., of which the ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ would seem to be an imitation. With Basil and these texts in his hands there is nothing left for Antiochus to have borrowed from the *Epistle*" (p. 259). It is to be presumed that no commentator could be found who gives a better explanation of the remarkable phrase τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. But it may be suggested that it comes out of one of the most striking passages of the New Testament, which is as a thread running through the context of the phrase in the *Epistle*. Observe that Polycarp in *Epist.* 7 quotes ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν (1 Joh. iv. 2—3), and then notice ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, ὅτι ἰσχυροί ἐστε...καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν. Μὴ

[2] Ὁ πίστει τρέχων διὰ τῶν ἐντολῶν κ.τ.λ. (1432 c).

ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ· ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονία τοῦ βίου, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστίν (1 Joh. ii. 14—16)[3], where *ἀλαζονία* may be regarded as a third kind of *ἐπιθυμία*. Hence we have only to write briefly *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἡ ἐπιθυμία...ἡ ἐπιθυμία*, that is *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι*, and Polycarp's *τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, is explained. Then we see that his *νεώτεροι*, from 1 Pet. v. 5, corresponds to St John's *νεανίσκοι*, it being quite usual with him to mix up texts in this way—and that his *παντὸς κακοῦ* is a variation upon *τὸν πονηρόν* κ.τ.λ. This shews plainly enough that the phrase *τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* stands in its proper context in the *Epistle* and not in the *Homilies*, where it is dissociated from Polycarp's practical advice to *νεώτεροι* and comes in as follows, namely in *Hom.* 74 (1648 C, D):

Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν.

γέγραπται, Ὅσοι πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ. ἐὰν οὖν υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαπήσωσιν τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τουτέστιν, δόξας ἀνθρωπίνας, ἐκ τούτων λοιπὸν γεννῶνται γίγαντες...ὑπερηφανία, ἔπαρσις, φυσίωσις, οἴησις, ὕψος, ἀλαζονεία...καὶ λέγει ὁ Θεός, Οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σαρκικοὺς τῶν κακῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. καθὼς καὶ ὁ Παῦλος λέγει, μεμφόμενος Γαλάταις, Πνεύματι ἀρξάμενοι, νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε. Καλὸν οὖν ἐστιν τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται· *ἡ γὰρ φιλήδονος καρδία εἰρκτὴ καὶ ἄλυσις τῇ ψυχῇ ἐν καιρῷ ἐξόδου γίνεται· ἡ δὲ φιλόπονος, θύρα ἐστὶν ἀνεῳγμένη* κ.τ.λ.

(1649 B.) *μισήσεις τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ χαλιναγωγήσεις αὐτὴν* κ.τ.λ.

If the homilist wrote the *Epistle*, a theory which "explains everything," he thought καλὸν τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι κ.τ.λ. striking and suggestive enough to be used twice over in strangely different ways: it is at least as simple a theory that he found it

[3] Antiochus *Hom.* 15 (1473 D) quotes 1 Joh. ii. 15—17, *Μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε* κ.τ.λ.

ready to hand in the *Epistle*, and thought it well worth quoting in his series of texts and other extracts illustrative of the subject, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν. It is hard to find here any trace of a "likeness of mind between Antiochus and the writer of the *Epistle*" (p. 284) that would raise the least suspicion of their identity; nor is it natural to think of the writer of the *Epistle* as drawing materials for his simple counsels to young men from this fanciful production of the homilist.

στρατεύεται] "To what text does the writer of the *Epistle* refer when he says that 'every ἐπιθυμία wars against the spirit'?[4] Antiochus uses these words and afterwards quotes 1 Pet. ii. 11." We are to infer that Antiochus wrote before Polycarp (p. 251).

οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα] Mr Cotterill (p. 251) raises a question about Polycarp's use of τὰ ἄτοπα, to which the commentaries do not supply a quite convincing answer: "What does the writer mean by οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα, where the οὔτε shows that ἄτοπα are not 'iniquities' that come from following 'lusts'? The writer adds 'wherefore it is necessary to abstain from all these, being in subjection to the Presbyters and Deacons.' Commentators think it necessary to have a note upon ἄτοπα. Antiochus does not here himself use the word, but the passage which he quotes from Dionysius does so and, read with Antiochus' context, explains its meaning. Antiochus says 'neither προπετεύεσθε in anything, as if for the sake of religion. Let all things be done decently and in order according to the Apostle. Since τί ἄτοπον ἐποίει ὁ Ὀζίας θυμιῶν...ὁ Σαοὺλ θύων...ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῇ τάξει αὐτοῦ ἔστω τῆς λειτουργίας...ἐπὶ τῇ προπετείᾳ (2 Sam. vi. 7 in A) Ὀζία κ.τ.λ.' It appears then that ἄτοπος is here[5] something 'out of place,' 'contrary to decency and order,' προπέτεια, disobedience and the like, and the *prompt* addition in the *Epistle* of the words 'being in subjection to presbyters &c.' is at once explained."

The chief point to be illustrated is Polycarp's use of τὰ ἄτοπα. A word must also be said on his so-called "*prompt* addition" of ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις,

[4] This saying amalgamates 1 Pet. ii. 11 and Gal. v. 17.

[5] No reason is given why the meaning "here" in *Hom.* 123 should govern the meaning in the *Epistle*.

which is in reality a subordinate clause, not immediately following *τὰ ἄτοπα* (p. 67).

τὰ ἄτοπα] I do not think that "the *οὔτε*" shews what it is said to shew, but would analyse the paragraph thus:

(i.) The main thesis is *καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται*, all the "lusts in the world" [*πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* (p. 69)] being included, and not only those directly akin to *πορνεία* and the like.

(ii.) The subject then subdivides into

a. *καὶ οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν*, and

b. *οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα* [*βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν*], this subsection being differentiated from subsection *a* by its position after the verb *κληρονομήσουσιν*, rather than by the mere use of *οὔτε* for the fourth time.

(iii.) *διὸ δέον ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων*, to abstain, that is, from all the lusts included in (i.) and the practices to which they lead.

The word *ἄτοπος* being used of persons as well as of things, write for brevity *ἄτοποι* instead of *ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα*: we have then to shew that in giving advice to young men it was natural and idiomatic for Polycarp to write in effect οὔτε πόρνοι ...οὔτε ἄτοποι.

In Athenaeus VII. 279 (Dindorf vol. ii. 603, 1827; Kaibel ii. 117, 1887) there are extracts from Bato Comicus, the first about a father who scolds his son's pedagogue for letting him run riot,

> *ἀπολώλεκας τὸ μειράκιόν μου παραλαβών,*
> *ἀκάθαρτε, καὶ πέπεικας ἐλθεῖν εἰς βίον*
> *ἀλλότριον αὑτοῦ, καὶ πότους ἑωθινοὺς*
> *πίνει διὰ σὲ νῦν κ.τ.λ.*

At the end of a score of lines of dialogue on this subject another extract from Bato is introduced:

καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἀνδροφόνῳ δὲ ἐπιγραφομένῳ ὁ αὐτὸς Βάτων διαπαίξας τινὰ τῶν ἐπιεικῶν φιλοσόφων ἐπιφέρει

ἐξὸν γυναῖκ' ἔχοντα κατακεῖσθαι καλήν,
καὶ Λεσβίου χυτρῖδε λαμβάνειν δύο·
ὁ φρόνιμός ἐστι τοῦτο[6], τοῦτο τἀγαθόν.
Ἐπίκουρος ἔλεγε ταῦθ' ἃ νῦν ἐγὼ λέγω.
εἰ τοῦτον ἔζων πάντες ὃν ἐγὼ ζῶ βίον,
οὔτ' ἄτοπος ἦν ἂν οὔτε μοιχὸς οὐδὲ εἷς.

There can be no better authority than a comic poet for colloquial uses such as this of ἄτοπος. If Bato, discussing the life of ἡδονή, writes οὔτ' ἄτοπος...οὔτε μοιχός, Polycarp in warning young men against ἐπιθυμίαι could quite naturally write οὔτε πόρνοι...οὔτε ἄτοποι, or οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα. His idiomatic use of ἄτοπα thus ceases to be a difficulty and becomes a mark of genuineness.

διὸ δέον ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων, ὑποτασσομένους κ.τ.λ.] It is incumbent upon young men to abstain from all such lusts and practices, ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ὡς Θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ: that is to say, they are not to be unruly, but to walk in the right way, following the lead of their spiritual guides. The clause ὑποτασσομένους κ.τ.λ. is a subordinate one, and does not seem to me to hint at the usurpation of ministerial functions by laymen [ὁ Ὀζίας θυμιῶν...ὁ Σαοὺλ θύων] any more (or more expressly) than the words "To submit myself to all my...spiritual pastors" in the child's Duty to his Neighbour in the Church Catechism. Such advice given specially to νεώτεροι, with reference to 1 Pet. v. 5 ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις, could not be narrowed to the sense to which Mr Cotterill assumes rather than argues that it must be restricted.

The priority of the *Epistle* being now supposed, and Antiochus *Hom.* 123 Περὶ διαταγῆς κλήρου being placed side by side with it, we see that the homilist follows the *Epistle* so far as his special subject allows; and that he omits the Polycarpian τὰ ἄτοπα κ.τ.λ. as inappropriate, goes off after his manner to another writer, "Dionysius the Areopagite," and quotes from his *Ep.* 8 τί ἄτοπον ἐποίει ὁ Ὀζίας θυμιῶν κ.τ.λ., where ἄτοπον has a sense which suits his discourse. If the

[6] Kaibel, ὁ φρόνιμος οὗτός ἐστι, with note, τὸ φρόνιμον AC.

reverse process of antedating the *Homily* and forcing its meaning of *ἄτοπον* into the *Epistle* makes the *Epistle* incoherent (p. 91), why should it be doubted that the hypothesis which leads to such a result is wrong? Antiochus himself supplies more suitable senses of *ἄτοπος*. Thus, in *Hom.* 26 (1517 c) he directs the monk in his cell suffering from *ennui* to pray, *Ῥῦσαί με τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν* [2 Thess. iii. 2] *λογισμῶν*: and in *Hom.* 95 (1724 c), *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ γελᾶν*, we are warned not to be caught by the Enemy in the nets of laughter, which begets lewd and devilish affections, *ἄτοπα καὶ διαβολικὰ πάθη· τῶν γὰρ ἀφρόνων ἐστὶν ὁ γέλως, μᾶλλον δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἑταιριζομένων ἀσυνέτων.*

Mr Cotterill's method[7], in comparing any two writings of which the one borrowed from the other, is "to place the language of parallel passages with their contexts side by side, and to conclude that that writer whose language is again and again explained by the other must needs have been the copyist" (p. 250). This principle is true within limits. Thus St John, as I have endeavoured to shew, explains Polycarp's *ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κ.τ.λ.* But if it were true in all cases without exception, it would follow that any commentary which explains a text must have been written before it. And the term "explain" must be used with proper limitations. To write out texts which an author obviously uses, to give chapter and verse, so to say, for his allusions when there is no room for doubt about them, is no explanation at all; and to do this is the mark, not of an earlier but of a later writer, including the case of the professed commentator. Consider the parallels on p. 261, where in the one column we find given from *Epist. Polyc.* 3—4...*προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς εἰς Θεὸν καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν πλησίον. ἐάν γάρ τις τούτων ἐντὸς ᾖ, πεπλήρωκεν ἐντολὴν δικαιοσύνης· ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην μακρὰν ἐστιν πάσης ἁμαρτίας...ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ τοῦ Κυρίου*, and in the opposite column from Antiochus *Hom.* 96 *ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον μακρὰν ἐστιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας... καὶ ἐπάγει· Πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη* (Rom. xiii. 10)...*καί· Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους* (St John xiii.

[7] The method is given as if it were Bishop Lightfoot's (pp. 250, 284), but I am concerned just now only with Mr Cotterill's use of it.

34). *Hom.* 114 *ὁ γὰρ ἔχων τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην, καὶ εἰς τὸν πλησίον, μακρὰν ἔσται πάσης ἁμαρτίας.* These extracts from the *Homilies* will make an excellent footnote for future editions of Polycarp, and readers will infer that his *Epistle* was known to Antiochus. It was part of this homilist's special business, in "expressly discoursing on a named subject, and illustrating that subject by parallel passages drawn from Scripture and other sources" (p. 253), to write out texts of Scripture as above. His subject in *Hom.* 96 is *Περὶ τοῦ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον,* and he quotes Rom. xiii. 10 and Joh. xiii. 34 just where he does because he finds something to hang them upon in his extract from Polycarp. From this and other such "explanations" of the *Epistle* by the *Homilies* I cannot infer the priority of the latter.

That there is a fallacy in the argument against the *Epistle* is manifest: on the nature of it we shall have something more to say lower down.

II. *Polycarp and Hermas.*

I pass on to the comparison of the *Shepherd of Hermas* with the *Epistle of Polycarp,* beginning with *Mand.* xii., the quotation of which by Mr Cotterill (p. 247) led me to suspect that Hermas knew the *Epistle.*

1.

Mand. xii. 1, 1 *Λέγει μοι, Ἆρον ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν πονηράν, ἔνδυσαι δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ σεμνήν· ἐνδεδυμένος γὰρ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ταύτην μισήσεις τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ χαλιναγωγήσεις αὐτήν, καθὼς βούλει.* 2 *ἀγρία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἡ πονηρὰ καὶ δυσκόλως ἡμεροῦται... δαπανᾷ δὲ τοὺς τοιούτους τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας ἔνδυμα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀγαθῆς, ἀλλὰ ἐμπεφυρμένους τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ κ.τ.λ.*

2, 1 *πρῶτον πάντων*[8] *ἐπιθυμία γυναικὸς ἀλλοτρίας ἢ ἀνδρὸς καὶ πολυτελείας πλούτου καὶ ἐδεσμάτων κ.τ.λ.* 2 *αὕτη γὰρ ἡ*

[8] So Hilgenfeld's *Hermae Pastor,* 1881. Mr Harmer, in the recently published *Apostolic Fathers* (1891) by Lightfoot and Harmer, reads *πάντων προέχουσα* for *πρῶτον πάντων* in 2, 1 and omits *νῖκος λαβὼν καί* in 2, 5. This edition takes the Lambros collation (1888) into account.

ἐπιθυμία ἡ πονηρὰ τοῦ διαβόλου θυγάτηρ ἐστίν. ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν πονηρῶν κ.τ.λ. 4 σὺ οὖν ἔνδυσαι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ καθοπλισάμενος τὸν φόβον κυρίου ἀντίστηθι αὐταῖς...ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἡ πονηρὰ ἐὰν ἴδῃ σε καθωπλισμένον τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθεστηκότα αὐτῇ, φεύξεται ἀπὸ σοῦ μακράν, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι σου ὀφθήσεται φοβουμένη τὰ ὅπλα σου. 5 σὺ οὖν [νῖκος λαβὼν καὶ] στεφανωθεὶς κατ' αὐτῆς ἐλθὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτῇ τὸ νῖκος ὃ ἔλαβες, δούλωσον αὐτῇ, καθὼς αὐτὴ βούλεται. ἐὰν δουλεύσῃς τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῇ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ὑποταγῇς αὐτῇ, δυνήσῃ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς πονηρᾶς κατακυριεῦσαι καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτήν, καθὼς βούλει.

The method of Hermas in citation, as I understand it, is fully set forth in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. XVIII. 297—325. His *Mand.* xii. is there shewn to contain expressions borrowed and adapted from the *Epistle of St James*. Noticing in Hermas 1, 1 *καθὼς βούλει* and 2, 5 *καθὼς αὐτὴ βούλεται...καθὼς βούλει*, and comparing James i. 26 *μὴ χαλιναγωγῶν γλῶσσαν*. iii. 2 *δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα*. 4 *ὅπου ἡ ὁρμὴ τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βούλεται*. 8 *τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων*, we see in Hermas the wicked *Ἐπιθυμία* represented as a beast to be bridled, like the tongue in St James, and hard to tame. Another obvious reference to St James is in 2, 4...*φεύξεται ἀπὸ σοῦ μακράν*: James iv. 7 *ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ· ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν*. To *ὑποτάγητε* corresponds in Hermas 2, 5 *καὶ ὑποταγῇς*: his *μακράν* is not accounted for by St James.

Turning now to *Epist. Polyc.* 5 (p. 67), *χαλιναγωγοῦντες... ἐπιθυμία...στρατεύεται κ.τ.λ.*, we find in brief compass what would have suggested to Hermas the two metaphors, of *bridling* *Ἐπιθυμία* [St James *γλῶσσα*], and of *fighting* with it [St James *τῷ διαβόλῳ*]. Also, piecing together words in *Epist.* 5, we get *διὸ δέον ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ...τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, and in Hermas 2, 2 *ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν*. 1, 2...*τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ*. The *Epistle* is a link between the writings of St James and Hermas. Hermas of himself might have thought of changing the "tongue" (Jas. i. 26), or *ὅλον τὸ σῶμα* (Jas. iii. 2), into the evil *Ἐπιθυμία*, or of changing "the

Devil" (Jas. iv. 7) into the evil Ἐπιθυμία; but when a word of Polycarp suggests both changes at once, we may fairly think that Hermas knew his *Epistle* also and used it with that of St James.

Another marked feature in Hermas *Mand.* xii. is the *arming* for the contest with ἐπιθυμία. The analysis of this shews a basis of Scripture interlaced with Polycarp's ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης (*Epist.* 4), which Hermas works up in his customary way when he writes in 2, 4...τῆς ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΣ καὶ ΚΑΘΟΠΛΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ...τὰ ὅπλα σου. Each of these words for "arming" occurs once only in the New Testament: the latter in the parable of the strong man καθωπλισμένος (Luke xi. 21), to which Hermas most plainly alludes by ἐὰν ἴδῃ σε καθωπλισμένον: the former in 1 Pet. iv. 1 τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὁπλίσασθε. An *Index of Scriptural Passages* (Lightfoot, p. 522, ed. 2) shews that Polycarp quotes more from 1 Peter than from any other Book: it is fair to assume therefore that 1 Peter has suggested his use of this ἅπαξ λεγ. in the New Testament. Hermas, following his usual course, would have preferred the compound καθοπλίζεσθαι, partly for the sake of the variation, and partly to bring a Gospel parable into the field of view.

μακράν] Hermas, we have seen, adds μακράν to St James' saying that the Devil if withstood will flee (p. 75). The word is distinctly Polycarpian, being found in *Epist.* 3 ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην μακράν ἐστιν πάσης ἁμαρτίας. 4 μακρὰν οὖσας πάσης διαβολῆς κ.τ.λ. 6 μακρὰν ὄντες πάσης φιλαργυρίας. These uses, and especially the second, may have influenced Hermas in *Mand.* xii. Notice in *Epist.* 5 μὴ διάβολοι: 1 Tim. iii. 11 γυναῖκας μὴ διαβόλους. Hermas calls Διψυχία a daughter of the Devil (*Mand.* ix. 9), making Λύπη and Ὀξυχολία her sisters (*Mand.* x. 1); and when he writes in *Mand.* xii. 2, 2 (p. 75) αὕτη γὰρ ἡ Ἐπιθυμία ἡ ΠΟΝΗΡΑ τοῦ διαβόλου θυγάτηρ ἐστίν... 4 ΦΕΥΞΕΤΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΣΟΥ ΜΑΚΡΑΝ, he may well have been thinking of Polycarp's μακρὰν διαβολῆς, in the inverted form ἡ διαβολὴ μακράν. In *Sim.* i., which is (one may say) on the cities of "God and Mammon," he writes at the beginning ἡ γὰρ πόλις ὑμῶν μακράν ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης, "The city of God is far from the city of Mammon,"—a piece of allegorising in the style

of Hermas on Polycarp's *μακρὰν πάσης φιλαργυρίας*[9]. The word *μακράν* is found also in several other places of Hermas, and the stress which he lays upon it may be due in part to the influence of Polycarp.

2.

If Hermas was a reader of Polycarp, it is likely that he would have made something out of the very remarkable saying on Faith in *Epist.* 3,

τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου...ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε, δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ΜΗΤΗΡ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΗΜΩΝ, *ἐπακολουθούσης τῆς ἐλπίδος, προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς εἰς Θεὸν καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν πλησίον.*

Accordingly we find *Πίστις μήτηρ* in *Vis.* iii. 8, 2—6,

2 *βλέπεις ἑπτὰ γυναῖκας κύκλῳ τοῦ πύργου: βλέπω, φημί κυρία...* 3 *ἡ μὲν πρώτη αὐτῶν ἡ κρατοῦσα τὰς χεῖρας Πίστις καλεῖται.* 4 *ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα ἡ περιεζωσμένη καὶ ἀνδριζομένη Ἐγκράτεια καλεῖται· αὕτη θυγάτηρ ἐστὶν τῆς Πίστεως.* 5 *αἱ δὲ ἕτεραι ...θυγατέρες ἀλλήλων εἰσίν· καλοῦνται δὲ ἡ μὲν Ἁπλότης, ἡ δὲ Ἀκακία, ἡ δὲ Σεμνότης, ἡ δὲ Ἐπιστήμη, ἡ δὲ Ἀγάπη. ὅταν οὖν τὰ ἔργα τῆς* ΜΗΤΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ *πάντα ποιήσῃς, δύνασαι ζῆσαι.* 7...*καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν ἀλλήλαις, καθὼς καὶ γεγεννημέναι εἰσίν. ἐκ τῆς Πίστεως γεννᾶται Ἐγκράτεια, ἐκ τῆς Ἐγκρατείας Ἁπλότης, ἐκ τῆς Ἁπλότητος Ἀκακία, ἐκ τῆς Ἀκακίας Σεμνότης, ἐκ τῆς Σεμνότητος Ἐπιστήμη, ἐκ τῆς Ἐπιστήμης Ἀγάπη.*

He makes Faith the mother, not of Christians but of all the virtues[10], replacing persons by abstract qualities as he does elsewhere. Thus, whereas in the New Testament persons are *τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου* (1 Joh. iii. 10), Hermas says this of *Διψυχία, Λύπη, Ὀξυχολία, Ἐπιθυμία* (p. 76). But in his subtle way he hints at a closer connexion between his saying and Polycarp's, when he writes *ὅταν...ποιήσῃς κ.τ.λ.*, "When *thou* doest all the works of *their* Mother"; for to do the works of Faith is the evidence that the doer is himself a *τέκνον τῆς*

[9] It is related of Diogenes in Diog. Laert. vi. 50 that *τὴν φιλαργυρίαν εἶπε μητρόπολιν πάντων τῶν κακῶν.*

[10] See also on St Clement of Rome's *πίστις πανάρετος*, note 16.

Πίστεως, according to Joh. viii. 39—41 *εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐστε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐποιεῖτε...ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν.* This links together Πίστις *μήτηρ ἡμῶν* and Πίστις *μήτηρ αὐτῶν.*

ἐπακολουθούσης] Cf. 1 Tim. v. 24, 25. Polycarp makes a point of the order of sequence of the Christian graces, and Hermas follows suit and writes *ἀκολουθοῦσιν ἀλλήλαις*, and states precisely in what order his Virtues follow and issue from one another. With *πίστιν...ἐπακολουθούσης τῆς ἐλπίδος* compare Gal. v. 5 *ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης.*

προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης] "On *προαγούσης* Bishop Lightfoot says '*going before* in reference to *ἐλπίς*, not to *πίστις*'... This however puts some force upon the language of the *Epistle.* The writer seems rather to consider Faith as the central object in the sequence, with Love leading the way and Hope following behind" (Cotterill, p. 262). But the architectural metaphor *οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν...πίστιν* [Col. i. 23 *τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι*] may be thought to point to Faith as the stationary goal[11], rather than as the central figure in a procession.

Faith, in *Epist.* 3, takes the place of the *ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ*[12], *ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν* (Gal. iv. 26), but the expression *οἰκοδομεῖσθαι* [2 Cor. v. 1 *οἰκοδομὴν...ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*] still points to the heavenly *city*, our *μητρόπολις.* If Hermas had set himself to allegorise Polycarp's *προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης* in his own parable of the Two Cities, he could scarcely have done it more simply than by writing as he has done in *Sim.* i. 8—10. Instead of laying up worldly possessions, he says, *ἀγοράζετε ψυχὰς θλιβομένας...πολὺ βέλτιόν ἐστι τοιούτους ἀγροὺς ἀγοράζειν καὶ κτήματα καὶ οἴκους, οὓς εὑρήσεις ἐν τῇ πόλει σου, ὅταν ἐπιδημήσῃς εἰς αὐτήν.* Do deeds of Love, and you will find that they have gone before you to the heavenly city. He does allegorise in this way, and he has the idea of *ἀγάπη προάγουσα*, from whatever source he derived it.

[11] Faith precedes Love even in Ignat. *Ephes.* 9 (p. 262) *προητοιμασμένοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ πατρός...ἡ δὲ πίστις ὑμῶν ἀναγωγεὺς ὑμῶν, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη ὁδὸς ἡ ἀναφέρουσα εἰς Θεόν*, where *πίστις* is the lifting-engine which draws the stones up to itself and to the building along the track—an "inclined plane" (Lightfoot) —of *ἀγάπη.* This is a realistic rendering of Gal. v. 6 *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.*

[12] On the reasonableness of this substitution see below, p. 37.

3.

There remains in the *Epistle* a most striking saying, that widows are an altar of God. Something will be said lower down (p. 89) in explanation of this: here I will simply quote the saying and its context, and seek for traces of their phraseology and meaning in Hermas.

Epist. 4 *ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ διδάξωμεν ἑαυτοὺς πρῶτον πορεύεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ τοῦ Κυρίου· ἔπειτα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.* ΤΑΣ ΧΗΡΑΣ *σωφρονούσας περὶ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου πίστιν,* ΕΝΤΥΓΧΑΝΟΥΣΑΣ ΑΔΙΑΛΕΙΠΤΩΣ *περὶ πάντων, μακρὰν οὔσας πάσης διαβολῆς, καταλαλιᾶς, ψευδομαρτυρίας, φιλαργυρίας, καὶ παντὸς κακοῦ· γινωσκούσας ὅτι εἰσὶ* ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ *Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅτι πάντα μωμοσκοπεῖται, καὶ λέληθεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν οὔτε λογισμῶν οὔτε ἐννοιῶν, οὔτε τι τῶν κρυπτῶν τῆς καρδίας.*

A trace of *ὁπλισώμεθα κ.τ.λ.* was found in *Mand.* xii. (p. 76): with *διδάξωμεν...τὰς χήρας* compare in *Vis.* ii. 4, 3 *Γραπτὴ δὲ νουθετήσει τὰς χήρας καὶ τοὺς ὀρφανούς.*

ἐντυγχανούσας ἀδιαλείπτως] This combination of words is not found in the New Testament, although *ἐντυγχάνειν* itself occurs five times in it, and *ἔντευξις* twice, namely in 1 Tim. ii. 1 *πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς,* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΕΙΣ, *εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*: *ib.* iv. 5 *ἁγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου θεοῦ καὶ* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΕΩΣ. To the former of these verses Polycarp's *ἐντυγχανούσας περὶ πάντων* may be supposed to refer, and at the same time to 1 Tim. v. 5 *ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα καὶ μεμονωμένη...προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσιν καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας.* He refers above perhaps to the preceding verse *μανθανέτωσαν πρῶτον τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον κ.τ.λ.*, while at the beginning of the chapter he quotes plainly from 1 Tim. vi. 7. 10. We may say then that his *ἐντυγχανούσας* implies a reference to St Paul's *ἐντεύξεις*, and that his *ἀδιαλείπτως* is a synonym for *νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας* brought in from another context. The phrase *ἐντυγχανούσας ἀδιαλείπτως* being thus accounted for as proper to Polycarp, and the word *θυσιαστήριον* being found in connexion with it, we shall next shew in Hermas traces of *ἐντυγχάνειν* or *ἔντευξις* in connexion with *ἀδιαλείπτως* (Rom. i. 9:

1 Thess.) or *ἀδιάλειπτος* (Rom. ix. 2; 2 Tim. i. 3): of the same in connexion with *θυσιαστήριον Θεοῦ*: of the combination *χήρας...ἀδιαλείπτως*: and of the idea that widows are a *θυσιαστήριον*. I give the passages in the order of the *Shepherd*.

Mand. x. 3, 2 *ὁ δὲ λυπηρὸς ἀνὴρ ... ἀνομίαν ἐργάζεται,* ΕΝΤΥΓΧΑΝΩΝ *μὴ ἐξομολογούμενος τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτυγχάνει ἀπὸ θεοῦ ὃ αἰτεῖται. πάντοτε γὰρ λυπηροῦ ἀνδρὸς ἡ* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΣ *οὐκ ἔχει δύναμιν τοῦ ἀναβῆναι ἐπὶ τὸ* ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ *τοῦ Θεοῦ.* 3 *διὰ τί, φημί, οὐκ ἀναβαίνει ἐπὶ τὸ* ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ *ἡ* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΣ *τοῦ λυπουμένου; ὅτι, φησίν, ἡ λύπη ἐγκάθηται εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ· μεμιγμένη οὖν ἡ λύπη μετὰ τῆς* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΕΩΣ *οὐκ ἀφίησι τὴν* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΝ *ἀναβῆναι καθαρὰν ἐπὶ τὸ* ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ *τοῦ Θεοῦ. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὄξος καὶ οἶνος μεμιγμένα ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡδονὴν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ λύπη μεμιγμένη μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὴν αὐτὴν* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΝ *οὐκ ἔχει.*

Sim. ii. 5 *ὁ μὲν πλούσιος ἔχει χρήματα πολλά, τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν κύριον πτωχεύει περισπωμένος περὶ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ καὶ λίαν μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν καὶ τὴν* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΝ *πρὸς τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἣν ἔχει, μικρὰν καὶ βληχρὰν καὶ ἄνω μὴ ἔχουσαν δύναμιν... ὁ πένης πλούσιός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΕΙ *καὶ τῇ ἐξομολογήσει καὶ δύναμιν μεγάλην ἔχει ἡ* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΣ *αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ· ἐπιχορηγεῖ οὖν ὁ πλούσιος τῷ πένητι πάντα ἀδιστάκτως.* 6 *ὁ πένης δὲ ἐπιχορηγούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πλουσίου* ΕΝΤΥΓΧΑΝΕΙ *αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ εὐχαριστῶν περὶ τοῦ διδόντος αὐτῷ. κἀκεῖνος ἔτι ἐπισπουδάζει περὶ τοῦ πένητος, ἵνα* ΑΔΙΑΛΕΙΠΤΟΣ *γένηται ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ· οἶδε γὰρ ὅτι ἡ* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΣ *τοῦ πένητος προσδεκτή ἐστι καὶ πλουσία πρὸς τὸν θεόν.* 7 *ἀμφότεροι οὖν τὸ ἔργον τελοῦσιν· ὁ μὲν πένης ἐργάζεται τὴν* ΕΝΤΕΥΞΙΝ, *ἐν ᾗ πλουτεῖ, ἣν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου.* 8 *...ἡ πτελέα ὕδωρ ἔχουσα τρέφει τὴν ἄμπελον, καὶ ἡ ἄμπελος* ΑΔΙΑΛΕΙΠΤΟΝ *ἔχουσα ὕδωρ διπλοῦν τὸν καρπὸν δίδωσι, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς πτελέας. οὕτω καὶ οἱ πένητες* ΕΝΤΥΓΧΑΝΟΝΤΕΣ *πρὸς τὸν κύριον ὑπὲρ τῶν πλουσίων κ.τ.λ.*

Sim. v. 3, 7 *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ νηστεύεις μηδὲν γεύσῃ εἰ μὴ ἄρτον καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων σου ὧν ἔμελλες τρώγειν συμψηφίσας τὴν ποσότητα τῆς δαπάνης ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἔμελλες ποιεῖν δώσεις αὐτὸ* ΧΗΡΑ *ἢ ὀρφανῷ ἢ ὑστερουμένῳ, καὶ οὕτω ταπεινοφρονήσεις, ἵν' ἐκ τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης σου ὁ εἰληφὼς ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ* ΕΥΞΗΤΑΙ *ὑπὲρ σοῦ*

πρὸς τὸν κύριον. 8 *ἐὰν οὖν οὕτω τελέσῃς τὴν νηστείαν, ὡς σοι ἐνετειλάμην, ἔσται ἡ θυσία σου δεκτὴ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ*[13], *καὶ ἔγγραφος ἔσται ἡ νηστεία αὕτη, καὶ ἡ λειτουργία οὕτως ἐργαζομένη καλὴ καὶ ἱλαρά ἐστιν καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτος τῷ κυρίῳ.*

Sim. v. 4, 3 *ὅσοι δὲ βληχροί εἰσι καὶ ἀργοὶ πρὸς τὴν* ἔντευξιν, *ἐκεῖνοι διστάζουσιν αἰτεῖσθαι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου.* 4 *ὁ δὲ κύριος πολυεύσπλαγχνός ἐστι καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς αἰτουμένοις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀδιαλείπτως δίδωσι. σὺ δὲ ἐνδεδυναμωμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀγγέλου καὶ εἰληφὼς παρ' αὐτοῦ τοιαύτην* ἔντευξιν *κ.τ.λ.*

Sim. ix. 27, 2 *πάντοτε τοὺς ὑστερημένους καὶ τὰς χήρας τῇ διακονίᾳ ἑαυτῶν ἀδιαλείπτως ἐσκέπασαν.*

The idea of receiving the faculty of ἔντευξις as a *χάρισμα* links *Sim.* v. 4, 4 to *Sim.* ii. 7 *ἣν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.*

Hermas in the five passages cited from the *Shepherd* seems to be harping upon the passage cited from *Epist. Polyc.* 4. Granted that in *Mand.* x. he may be thinking of Rev. v. 8 and viii. 3—5, there, however, the word for prayer is *προσευχή* and not *ἔντευξις*. It is Polycarp who suggests the combination *ἐντυγχάνειν, ἔντευξις, θυσιαστήριον.* His *ἐντυγχάνειν ἀδιαλείπτως* supplies a theme for *Sim.* ii. and *Sim.* v. 4. Lastly, *Sim.* v. 3 speaks of the produce of self-denial given to the widow as a sacrifice to God (χήρᾳ...θυσίᾳ...Θεῷ) in accordance with Polycarp's χήρας...θυσιαστήριον Θεοῦ, and likewise brings in the idea of *ἔντευξις* by its *εὔξηται ὑπὲρ σοῦ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.* These truly Hermas-like variations in sense and in phraseology on *τὰς χήρας...ἐντυγχανούσας ἀδιαλείπτως...ὅτι εἰσὶ θυσιαστήριον*[14] Θεοῦ are enough of themselves to make it highly probable that the writer of the *Shepherd* actually had in mind the *Epistle* of Polycarp. The case is strengthened by his apparent allusions to *ὁπλισώμεθα κ.τ.λ.* and *μακρὰν κ.τ.λ.* (p. 76) in the same

[13] Antiochus in *Hom.* 7 (1456 A) quotes this saying on "*νηστεία ἀληθινή*," and adds *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Ἡσαΐας φησίν· Νηστεύων διάθρυπτε πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον σου* (Is. lviii. 7).

[14] There is a reading *θυσιαστήρια* which makes the widows severally "altars." This may be illustrated from other writings (p. 90), and it suits the passage cited above from Herm. *Sim.* v. 3, where the gift of an individual *χήρᾳ ἢ ὀρφανῷ ἢ ὑστερουμένῳ* is regarded as a *θυσία τῷ Θεῷ* offered upon the recipient as altar.

chapter; and it will be shewn (p. 88) that he has remarkable coincidences with the beginning of the chapter.

Thus it would seem that the whole of chap. 4 is absorbed and worked up in the *Shepherd*.

4.

Epist. 11. Nimis contristatus sum pro Valente, qui presbyter factus est aliquando apud vos, quod sic ignoret is locum qui datus est ei. Moneo itaque vos, ut abstineatis vos ab avaritia et sitis casti veraces...Si quis non se abstinuerit ab avaritia, ab idololatria coinquinabitur, et tanquam inter gentes judicabitur, qui *ignorant judicium Domini*... Valde ergo, fratres, contristor pro illo et pro coniuge ejus, quibus det Dominus poenitentiam veram.

avaritia...tanquam inter gentes] "Avaritia" doubtless stands for *φιλαργυρία* rather than for *πλεονεξία*, "which is idolatry" (Col. iii. 5). Wealth or Mammon (Matt. vi. 24) may indeed be made an idol, and so *φιλαργυρία* may be said to be idolatry; but this is not expressly stated here. What is said is that the *φιλάργυρος* will come into contact and be tainted with idolatry, as it is said in *Test. Jud.* 19 *ἡ φιλαργυρία πρὸς εἰδωλα ὁδηγεῖ*. So in Hermas *Sim.* viii. 9, 1 πλουτήσαντες δὲ *καὶ γενόμενοι ἔνδοξοι* παρὰ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν *ὑπερηφανίαν μεγάλην ἐνεδύσαντο καὶ ὑψηλόφρονες ἐγένοντο καὶ κατέλιπον τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ οὐκ ἐκολλήθησαν τοῖς δικαίοις, ἀλλὰ* μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν[15] *συνέζησαν*... 2 *πολλοὶ οὖν ἐξ αὐτῶν μετενόησαν καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ κατοίκησις αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πύργῳ*. 3 *ἕτεροι δὲ εἰς τέλος* μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν *συνζῶντες καὶ* φθειρόμενοι ταῖς κενοδοξίαις τῶν ἐθνῶν *ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀπέστησαν* ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις δουλεύοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν. οὗτοι μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐλογίσθησαν. Through *φιλαργυρία* they "were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works," and so were reckoned as heathens and condemned as such to exclusion from the tower.

Compare also the following passages of Hermas, which shew

[15] Mr Harmer reads *κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη*, and in 3 *ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἔπραξαν τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἐθνῶν*.

in different ways how the quest or possession of wealth leads to apostasy:

Vis. iii. 6, 5 ὅταν γένηται θλῖψις, διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τὰς πραγματείας ἀπαρνοῦνται τὸν Κύριον αὐτῶν.

Sim. i. 5 ἕνεκεν τῶν ἀγρῶν σου καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ὑπάρξεως τὸν νόμον σου πάντως ἀπαρνήσῃ καὶ πορεύσῃ τῷ νόμῳ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης. 10 τὴν οὖν πολυτέλειαν τῶν ἐθνῶν μὴ πράσσετε.

Sim. iv. 4 τὰ δὲ ἔθνη καυθήσονται, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν κτίσαντα αὐτούς. 5 ...οἱ γὰρ τὰ πολλὰ πράσσοντες πολλὰ καὶ ἁμαρτάνουσι περισπώμενοι περὶ τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν καὶ μηδὲν δουλεύοντες τῷ Κυρίῳ ἑαυτῶν. 7 ἐὰν δὲ μίαν τις πρᾶξιν ἐργάσηται, δύναται καὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ δουλεῦσαι· οὐ γὰρ διαφθαρήσεται ἡ διάνοια αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ δουλεύσει αὐτῷ ἔχων τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ καθαράν.

Sim. viii. 8, 2 διὰ γὰρ τὰς πραγματείας αὐτῶν ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν Κύριον καὶ ἀπηρνήσαντο αὐτόν.

That φιλαργυρία should be said to tend to implication in, rather than be itself "idolatry" is in agreement with its previous mention in *Epist.* 4 as ἀρχὴ πάντων χαλεπῶν.

casti veraces] Assuming "casti" to stand for ἁγνοί, Bp Lightfoot well remarks that it "might still apply to the absence of sordid and dishonest motives, as e.g. in Phil. i. 17 Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν οὐχ ἁγνῶς: see Pind. *Olymp.* iii. 21 ἁγνὰ κρίσις... The other epithet *veraces* again points to dishonesty, rather than unchastity, as the vice which is here condemned." These uses of *casti* and *veraces* may be illustrated from Hermas, as below. Notice in *Vis.* iii. 7, 3 the phrase ἡ ἁγνότης τῆς ἀληθείας, and in *Did.* xv. ἀφιλαργύρους καὶ ἀληθεῖς.

veraces] Hermas says of himself in *Mand.* iii. 3 οὐδέπω...ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ ζωῇ ἀληθὲς ἐλάλησα ῥῆμα, ἀλλὰ πάντοτε πανοῦργος ἔζησα μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸ ψεῦδός μου ἀληθὲς ἐπέδειξα παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κ.τ.λ. 5 ἵνα καὶ τὰ πρότερον ἃ ἐλάλησας ψεύδη ἐν ταῖς πραγματείαις σου κ.τ.λ. It was his quest of money, through πραγματεῖαι, that made him speak untruth. Cf. *Vis.* ii. 3, 1 ταῖς πραγματείαις σου ταῖς πονηραῖς: *Sim.* ix. 19, 3 διὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ λήμματος ὑπεκρίθησαν. Notice the remarkable association of dishonesty and untruth in *Did.* iii., "Falsehood leads to theft," comparing Antiochus *Hom.* 41

(1561 c) *τὸ γὰρ κλέμμα σύμβολόν ἐστιν τοῦ ἀφίστασθαι τῆς ἀληθείας· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ τῆς δεσποτικῆς προδοσίας* (Joh. xii. 4—6), and the juxtaposition of "thefts, idolatries" in *Did.* v. Hermas brings together *κλέμμα, ψεῦσμα, ἀποστέρησις, ψευδομαρτυρία, πλεονεξία* in *Mand.* viii. 5.

casti] Cf. *Sim.* ix. 25, 2 *οἱ διδάξαντες σεμνῶς καὶ ἁγνῶς τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου...ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ πορευθέντες*: *ib.* 26, 2 *κακῶς διακονήσαντες καὶ διαρπάσαντες χηρῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν τὴν ζωὴν καὶ ἑαυτοῖς περιποιησάμενοι ἐκ τῆς διακονίας ἧς ἔλαβον διακονῆσαι...ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἁγνῶς τελειώσωσι τὴν διακονίαν αὐτῶν, δυνήσονται ζῆσαι.* This looks very like the case of Valens, the mention of repentance [*quibus det Dominus poenitentiam veram*] not excepted. See also *Vis.* iii. 5, 1 *καὶ ἐπισκοπήσαντες καὶ διδάξαντες καὶ διακονήσαντες ἁγνῶς κ.τ.λ.* The writer of the *Shepherd* may have taken a hint from the defalcations of Valens when he makes Hermas confess his own corruption through *φιλαργυρία*, and again when he refers to the maladministration of charity funds by avaricious ministers in *Sim.* ix. 26. The wife (*σύμβιος*) of Hermas like the wife of Valens comes under censure, with hope of repentance and *ἔλεος*, in *Vis.* ii. 2, 3.

III. *The Epistle of Polycarp.*

I will now take the chapters of the *Epistle* of Polycarp in their order, remarking upon the character of some of his sayings, and continuing the comparison of the *Epistle* with the *Shepherd* of Hermas and the *Homilies* of Antiochus.

Epist. 1 *Συνεχάρην ὑμῖν μεγάλως ἐν Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, δεξαμένοις τὰ μιμήματα τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἀγάπης καὶ προπέμψασιν, ὡς ἐπέβαλεν ὑμῖν, τοὺς ἐνειλημένους τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσιν δεσμοῖς, ἅτινά ἐστιν διαδήματα τῶν ἀληθῶς ὑπὸ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐκλελεγμένων· καὶ ὅτι ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ῥίζα, ἐξ ἀρχαίων καταγγελλομένη χρόνων, μέχρι νῦν διαμένει καὶ καρποφορεῖ εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.*

Nothing in this exordium is commonplace. The phrase *τὰ μιμήματα τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἀγάπης* at once arrests the attention,

and commentators make their notes upon it accordingly. Next comes the bold thought—how far original in Polycarp we need not ask—that the fetters of those "copies of the true Love" are to them as diadems. Lastly, combining different aspects of faith, he says in effect that the Philippians' faith is *ἐρριζωμένη καὶ τεθεμελιωμένη*, and that it is not only firmly rooted but *καρποφορεῖ εἰς Χριστόν*. Hence Antiochus may have drawn his expression *καρπὸν πίστεως* (*Hom.* 130). *Πίστις καρποφοροῦσα* leads up to *Πίστις μήτηρ*[16] in chap. 3, where some commentators aptly quote *Mart. Justin. et soc.* 4 *ὁ ἀληθινὸς ἡμῶν πατήρ ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ μήτηρ ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν Πίστις*. A further reference to *ῥίζα πίστεως καρποφορεῖ εἰς Χριστόν* in this chapter would have given completeness to the parallel.

δεσμοῖς, ἅτινά ἐστιν διαδήματα] Compare in Herm. *Mand.* xii. 2, 5 *στεφανωθεὶς...ἐὰν δουλεύσῃς* (p. 75), to be in bonds to the good is to be "crowned" and victorious over the evil propensity.

Epist. 2 *...καὶ θρόνον ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ...ὁ δὲ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ, ἐὰν ποιῶμεν αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα καὶ πορευώμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ ἠγάπησεν, ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ἀδικίας, πλεονεξίας, φιλαργυρίας, καταλαλιᾶς, ψευδομαρτυρίας...μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος διδάσκων· ΜΗ ΚΡΙΝΕΤΕ, ΙΝΑ ΜΗ ΚΡΙΘΗΤΕ κ.τ.λ.*

ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ ἠγάπησεν] This stands in its proper context in the *Epistle*, where it is led up to by *ὁ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ*. Antiochus writes in *Hom.* 114 (Cotterill, p. 264) *καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐὰν ποιῶμεν αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα, καὶ πορευώμεθα κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ αὐτὸς ἀγαπᾷ, ναὸς αὐτοῦ γινόμεθα*, connecting *Epist.* 2 [cf. p. 101] with his own free version of Ignat. *Ephes.* 9 in *Hom.* 1 (1432 B) *ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη ὁδὸς ἡ ἀναφέρουσα εἰς τὸν Θεόν. καὶ ὁ τοιοῦτος γίνεται...ναὸς Θεοῦ* [Ign. *ἐστὲ οὖν...ναοφόροι*].

There are places in Hermas where he seems, not indeed to quote but to imitate, as in *Mand.* ix. 10 *ἡ γὰρ πίστις πάντα ἐπαγγέλλεται, πάντα τελειοῖ*, which must have been suggested

[16] The fruit of faith being good works or virtues, and faith being *πανάρετος* (p. 100) and also *μήτηρ*, it follows that faith may be regarded as *ῥίζα* or *μήτηρ πασῶν τῶν ἀρετῶν*.

by 1 Cor. xiii. 7 *πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει* ...10 *ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον*: notice in *Vis.* i. 3, 4 and 1 Cor. xiii. 2 the phrase *ὄρη μεθιστάνειν*. So there may be a reminiscence of Polycarp's *ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ ἠγάπησεν κ.τ.λ.* in *Vis.* iii. 1, 9 *ὁ εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τόπος ἄλλων ἐστίν...καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν ἐργάσωνται τὰ ἐκείνων ἔργα καὶ ὑπενέγκωσιν ἃ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι ὑπήνεγκαν*. A link between the two thoughts is St Paul's *ἡ ἀγάπη...πάντα ὑπομένει*, taken with the saying of St James i. 12, that the man *ὃς ὑπομένει* shall receive the crown of life promised *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν*. The symbolical act *καὶ ἐγείρει με* in *Vis.* iii. 2, 4 corresponds to *ἐγείρας...ἐγερεῖ* in the *Epistle*. The series of sayings of the Lord *μὴ κρίνετε κ.τ.λ.* is more fully given in Clem. Rom. 13, and again, as Mr Cotterill has pointed out in *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins App.* C (1884), in a parallel passage of Clem. Alex. which had been overlooked. See also Resch *Agrapha, Logion* 2 (1889). The clauses *ὡς ποιεῖτε κ.τ.λ. ὡς δίδοτε* (Clem. R. and Clem. A.) may be compared with Obadiah 15.

Epist. 3 *ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐμαυτῷ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς προεπεκαλέσασθέ με... δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν* ΠΙΣΤΙΝ, *ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν...ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην μακράν ἐστιν πάσης ἁμαρτίας*

προεπεκαλέσασθε] This satisfactory reading is favoured by the Latin *provocastis*: the Greek manuscripts, for the readings of which see Lightfoot *in loc.*, favour *προεπηλακισασθε*, a reading open to objection on grammatical and exegetical grounds. Mr Cotterill nevertheless prefers it (p. 277), and he points out that *προπηλακίζειν* is used twice by Dionys. Areop. in the neighbourhood of the passage *τί ἄτοπον ἐποίει ὁ Ὀζίας θυμιῶν κ.τ.λ.* cited from him by Antiochus (p. 70). "The theory that Antiochus was himself the writer of the *Epistle* [of Polycarp] explains everything" (Cotterill, p. 284): if the Dionysian *τί ἄτοπον* suggested *τὰ ἄτοπα* in *Epist.* 5, the Dionysian *προπηλακίζειν* may have suggested *προεπηλακίσασθε* in *Epist.* 3. If however the argument on the first count fails (as I think it does) completely (p. 73), the coincidence, if there be a coincidence, *in re προπηλακιζειν* loses its significance; and perhaps

after all *προεπηλακίσασθε*, from an assumed middle *προπηλακίζεσθαι*, and which could scarcely mean anything where it stands, is only a creation of the scribes. It finds no favour with editors of the *Apostolic Fathers*. The compound *προεπικαλεῖσθαι* is unexceptionable, although not found in the lexicons.

In illustration of *πίστις μήτηρ* Mr Cotterill (p. 261 n.) refers to the first *Sermo* of Antonius Melissa, where we read ΠΙCΤΙC ΜΗΤΗΡ *καὶ στεφάνη καὶ συμπεραίωσις τῶν ἀρετῶν ὑπάρχει*: this favours our comparison of *πίστις μήτηρ* in Polycarp and Hermas (p. 77). Compare in Chrysost. *Hom. in Joan.* 33 *init. πίστεως τῆς μητρὸς τῶν ἀγαθῶν*[17]. It remains to shew that the idea of *πίστις μήτηρ* is presumably original in the *Epistle*. It is startling at first sight to find Faith substituted for the heavenly Jerusalem in Polycarp's allusion to Gal. iv. 26 *ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἥτις ἐστιν μήτηρ ἡμῶν*, and he is accordingly credited with "loose quotation," when he is rather restoring the true antithesis, which in St Paul "melts away in the general fusion of the sentence." After *αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθῆκαι, μία μὲν εἰς δουλειαν γεννῶσα*, we expect *ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα εἰς ἐλευθερίαν*, and it is this covenant, which is *ἐκ πίστεως*, that is *μήτηρ ἡμῶν*. Hence quite naturally *πίστις μήτηρ ἡμῶν*. St Paul in verse 28 writes *ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐσμέν* and *ib.* iii. 22 *ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως*, which together suggest *τέκνα πίστεως*, while in Gal. iii. 7, *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοί εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ*, the mere personification of Faith would bring us again to the idea *υἱοι πίστεως μητρός*. Given this thought in Polycarp, we find in Hermas only such a variation upon it as might have been expected from him, his heptad of virtues taking the place of Polycarp's triad. With St Paul's *ἐκ πίστεως* and *γεννῶσα* compare *Vis.* iii. 8, 7 *ἐκ τῆς Πίστεως γεννᾶται* κ.τ.λ. (p. 77).

When Antiochus in *Hom.* 15 varies his quotation of Hermas *Sim.* i. by speaking of *ἀγροὺς καὶ κτήματα* such as *προάγουσιν εἰς τὴν ἡμῶν μητρόπολιν*, having "previously used the word *ἐπακολουθήσωμεν*, and explained the 'city' of Hermas as *τὴν*

[17] Ant. *Hom.* 103 (1745A) calls timely silence *μητηρ ἐννοιων συφωτάτων*, and adds *ἡ οὖν ἡσυχία ὡς καλὴ οὖσα μητηρ πασῶν τῶν ἀρετῶν τυγχάνει*, "mater jure censetur virtutum monachi," which is perhaps only a recasting of the old saying *πιστις μητηρ πασων των ἀρετῶν* for monastic use.

ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ," as Mr Cotterill remarks (p. 263)—we may suppose him to be alluding to Polycarp's πίστις μήτηρ ἡμῶν, ἐπακολουθούσης τῆς ἐλπίδος, προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης.

Epist. 4. Ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν, ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ διδάξωμεν ἑαυτοὺς πρῶτον πορεύεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ τοῦ Κυρίου· ἔπειτα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ δοθείσῃ αὐταῖς πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ κ.τ.λ. τὰς χήρας...θυσιαστήριον.

Mr Cotterill here quotes with approval the remark that "the mention of covetousness seems very abrupt" (p. 263). But there is no very great difficulty in the contrast between the immediately preceding ἀγάπη (chap. 3) and φιλαργυρία, which (as the words following in the *Epistle* suggest) is the love of τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Compare the contrast in 1 Joh. ii. 15. St John uses ἀγάπη...ἀγάπη [*Epist. Polyc.* 9 οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα] of the love of the Father and the love of the world respectively; but for the latter we may fairly substitute from St James iv. 4 ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου. The collocation in Antiochus *Hom.* 130 ...φιλαργυρία ἡ ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν, φιλοκοσμία may have been suggested by Polycarp's φιλαργυρία κ.τ.λ. εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Compare in Hermas *Vis.* i. 1, 8 μάλιστα οἱ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον περιποιούμενοι καὶ γαυριῶντες ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῶν. But if there were any difficulty in Polycarp's way of bringing in φιλαργυρία, it would be for the New Testament commentator to explain it under 1 Tim. vi. 7—11, οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον κ.τ.λ. οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ παγίδα καὶ ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς ἀνοήτους καὶ βλαβεράς, αἵτινες βυθίζουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν· ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία, ἧς τινες ὀρεγόμενοι ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις πολλαῖς. Σὺ δέ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε θεοῦ, ταῦτα φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, εὐσέβειαν, πίστιν, ἀγάπην, ὑπομονήν, πραϋπαθίαν. ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως. This sufficiently accounts for Polycarp's antithesis φιλαργυρία, ἀγάπη, and likewise for his ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις τῆς δικαιοσύνης in connexion therewith. Hermas in *Sim.* i. 8 ἀντὶ

ἀγρῶν οὖν ἀγοράζετε ψυχὰς θλιβομένας (p. 78) says in effect, "Renounce love of money and pursue Love[18]."

χαλεπῶν] Hermas in *Sim.* i., on the cities of God and Mammon, writes as if he had the text *We brought nothing into the world &c.* (1 Tim. vi. 7) in mind, as Antiochus seems to have thought, if we may judge from his treatment of the subject in *Hom.* 15 (Cotterill, p. 263). The *Shepherd* moreover being confessedly full of the theme, *Ἀρχὴ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία*, all parts of *Epist.* 4 are worked up in it (p. 82). Polycarp's χαλεπῶν, for St Paul's *κακῶν*, is to be especially noticed. It comes in naturally enough as denoting the troubles entailed by *φιλαργυρία*, but its use for *κακῶν* amounts to saying *χαλεπὰ τὰ κακά*, instead of the proverbial *χαλεπὰ τὰ καλά*. The way of virtue is properly χαλεπή, but Hermas interchanges the characters of the two ways, writing in *Mand.* vi. 1, 3—4...*οἱ δὲ τῇ ὀρθῇ ὁδῷ πορευόμενοι ὁμαλῶς περιπατοῦσι καὶ ἀπροσκόπτως κ.τ.λ.*, and at the end of *Mand.* vi. *πίστευε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ἀγγέλου τῆς πονηρίας* χαλεπά *ἐστι*. Cf. *Vis.* i. 4, 2. *Epist.* 4 may have helped to suggest this paradox, or his expression of it, to Hermas. Polycarp in *Mart. Polyc.* 11 says, *καλὸν δὲ μετατίθεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν χαλεπῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δίκαια.*

χήρας...θυσιαστήριον] Notice in *Epist.* 6 *μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χήρας ἢ ὀρφανοῦ ἢ πένητος*, comparing Hermas *Sim.* i. 8 *ἀγοράζετε ψυχὰς θλιβομένας... καὶ χήρας καὶ ὀρφανοὺς ἐπισκέπτεσθε καὶ μὴ παραβλέπετε αὐτούς.* On Ignatius *Eph.* 5 *ἐὰν μή τις ᾖ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* Bp Lightfoot writes, "The *θυσιαστήριον* here is not the altar, but the enclosure in which the altar stands...the precinct of the altar, as distinguished from the outer court... Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 6 (p. 848) *ἔστι γοῦν τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν θυσιαστήριον ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἐπίγειον τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἀνακειμένων*...Somewhat similarly in Polyc. *Phil.* 4 *γινωσκούσας ὅτι εἰσὶν θυσιαστήριον* Θεοῦ, it is applied to a section of the Church, the body of 'widows'; see also *Apost. Const.* iii. 6, 14, iv. 3." But there is nothing to shew

[18] This contrast is found *passim* in one form or other. Cf. Mark x. 21 *ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ δὸς πτωχοῖς*: Clem. R. II. 4 *καὶ συμπάσχειν ἀλλήλοις ὀφείλομεν, καὶ μὴ φιλαργυρεῖν*: Sym. Metaphr. *Serm.* 4 (Migne *P. G.* tom. 32, 1157 B) *ὅσον γὰρ πλεονάζεις τῷ πλούτῳ, τοσοῦτον ἐλλείπεις τῇ ἀγάπῃ.*

that Clement's form of the saying preceded Polycarp's; and in the places of *Apost. Const.* referred to *θυσιαστήριον* means not *altar-precinct* but *altar*: *A. C.* iii. 6 *γνωριζέτω οὖν ἡ χήρα ὅτι θυσιαστήριόν ἐστι Θεοῦ* [Polyc. *γινωσκούσας κ.τ.λ.*], *καὶ καθίσθω ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτῆς...οὐδὲ γάρ ποτε τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ περιτρέχει, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑνὶ τόπῳ ἵδρυται*: 14 *καὶ ἡ χήρα προσευχέσθω ὑπὲρ τοῦ δεδωκότος, ὅς τις πότ' ἂν ᾖ, ἅγιον θυσιαστήριον Χριστοῦ ὑπάρχουσα*: iv. 3 *ὁ μὲν γὰρ δι' ἡλικίαν ὀρφανίας κ.τ.λ. λαμβάνων, ὁ τοιοῦτος οὐ μόνον οὐ μεμφθήσεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπαινεθήσεται· θυσιαστήριον γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ λελογισμένος, ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τιμηθήσεται· ἀόκνως ὑπὲρ τῶν διδόντων αὐτῷ διηνεκῶς προσευχόμενος*. Alms bestowed on a poor man being an offering to the Lord, the poor man is logically represented to be the altar on which the gift is offered. In *T. B. Joma* 71 *a* the like is said of the disciples of the wise: he who would pour wine upon the altar, let him fill their throat with wine,

ואמר רבי ברכיה הרצה לנסך יין ע"ג המזבח ימלא גרונן של תלמידי חכמים יין שנא׳ אליכם אישים אקרא.

The alms of Christian congregations being given to orphans, widows and others in want (Justin *Apol.* i. 67), and the widows being singled out from the list, these are likened to a *θυσιαστήριον* or *altar* on which offerings to God are placed. Instead of alms they themselves offer *ἐντεύξεις*, which are accordingly included in the *θυσία* offered upon themselves as *θυσιαστήριον*. Polycarp naturally dwells upon the purity required in their contribution to the *θυσία*, saying nothing about its primary element of alms given to them and thus, as it were, offered upon them to God: Heb. xiii. 16 *τοιαύταις θυσίαις κ.τ.λ.* But for this, their *ἐντεύξεις* might indeed be called sacrifices, but it would not be easy to see why they themselves should be called the *altar*. This point is brought out very clearly by the use of *θυσιαστήριον* to designate an individual *χήρα* or recipient of alms in *Apost. Const.* iii. and iv. as above cited. In Hermas *Sim.* ii. the rich first gives his alms: the poor then adds his prayers (p. 80). For more on the saying see p. 102.

Epist. 5 *...ὀφείλομεν ἀξίως τῆς ἐντολῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ δόξης περιπατεῖν. ὁμοίως διάκονοι ἄμεμπτοι κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ τῆς*

δικαιοσύνης, ὡς Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διάκονοι καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων[39]· *μὴ διάβολοι, μὴ δίλογοι, ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα, εὔσπλαγχνοι, ἐπιμελεῖς...ὁμοίως καὶ νεώτεροι ἄμεμπτοι ἐν πᾶσιν, πρὸ παντὸς προνοοῦντες ἁγνείας...τὰς παρθένους ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει περιπατεῖν.*

τὰς παρθένους] The sentence *τὰς παρθένους...ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει περιπατεῖν*, according to Mr Cotterill (p. 275), "drops into the *Epistle* from the clouds, as it were, so abrupt and contrary to the sequence of ideas is the mention of the *virgins*." But when the latter half of the chapter is mainly on the duty of *ἁγνεία* in young men, why should not a word be said in conclusion on the corresponding duty of *παρθένοι*? If an interpretation of the intervening *ἄτοπα* breaks this simple sequence of ideas, the natural inference is that the interpretation (p. 70) is as inappropriate as it is arbitrary. The sentence is a mere variation on words of Clement of Rome (p. 101), and it comes in quite naturally.

δόξης...κατενώπιον] In Antiochus *Hom.* 123 we read *ἄμεμπτοι κατενώπιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ* in place of Polycarp's *ἄμεμπτοι κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, which is presumably the original phrase, and may have been derived from Eph. i. 4 *ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ*, with the appropriate addition of *τῆς δικαιοσύνης*. Notice the preceding *δόξης* in *Epist.* 5, and *ἀμώμῳ* at the end of the chapter, and in Jude 24 *κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους*. See vol. XIX. 267, 275.

To walk worthily of "His glory" [cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12], one must be mindful of it, as Hermas in *Vis.* iii. 1, 5 *μνησθεὶς τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ...ἐξωμολογούμην κ.τ.λ.* Mr Cotterill imagines a reference to *τὴν δόξαν τῆς παρθενίας* (p. 274) in "His glory."

ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα, εὔσπλαγχνοι] Antiochus *Hom.* 123 (p. 246) *ἐγκρατεῖς, περὶ πάντας εὔσπλαγχνοι*, a manifest error of a sort which betrays the copyist: *ἐγκρατεῖς* might very well stand alone, and "all" might be joined with *εὔσπλαγχνοι*, but not in the form *περὶ πάντας*.

With *ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα* compare 1 Cor. ix. 25 *ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται*. Hermas writes paradoxically in *Mand.* viii. 1 *ἡ ἐγκράτεια διπλῆ ἐστίν. ἐπί τινων γὰρ δεῖ*

[39] This clause is vouched for by a Syriac extract from the *Epistle* (p. 104).

ἐγκρατεύεσθαι, ἐπί τινων δὲ οὐ δεῖ. 2 ...τὸ πονηρὸν ἐγκρατεύου ...τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν μὴ ἐγκρατεύου.

With εὔσπλαγχνοι in *Epist.* 5 compare εὔσπλαγχνοι, εἰς πάντας ἐλεήμονες in *Epist.* 6: also in Herm. *Sim.* ix. 24, 2 καὶ πάντοτε σπλάγχνον ἔχοντες ἐπὶ πάντα ἄνθρωπον, and in *Test. Zab.* 5 καὶ εὐσπλαγχνίαν πρὸς πάντας ἔχειν. Antiochus might have written εἰς, or ἐπὶ, or πρὸς πάντας εὔσπλαγχνοι in *Hom.* 123, but his περὶ πάντας is clearly a slip for περὶ πάντα, which belongs to the preceding ἐγκρατεῖς.

Epist. 6 καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι δὲ εὔσπλαγχνοι, εἰς πάντας ἐλεήμονες, ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα...μὴ ταχέως πιστεύοντες κατά τινος, μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει, εἰδότες ὅτι πάντες ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας ... ἀπέναντι γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσμὲν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι. οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ... ἀπεχόμενοι τῶν... ἐν ὑποκρίσει φερόντων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου, οἵτινες ἀποπλανῶσι κενοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

Mr Cotterill (p. 249 n.)[20] compares Hermas *Mand.* v. 2, 1 τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς ὀξυχολίας... πῶς ἀποπλανᾷ αὐτούς... οὐκ ἀποπλανᾷ δὲ τοὺς πλήρεις ὄντας ἐν τῇ πίστει... ἀποπλανᾷ δὲ τοὺς ἀποκένους καὶ διψύχους ὄντας, which may have been suggested by the *Epistle*. With ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα κ.τ.λ. compare *Sim.* vi. 3, 1 βλέπων οὖν αὐτὰ οὕτω μαστιγούμενα κ.τ.λ. 3 παραλαμβάνει οὖν τοὺς ἀποπλανωμένους... 6 καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν δουλεύουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ. The neuter refers to the preceding πρόβατα. There is no difficulty in the change of genders ἀποπεπλανημένα...ἀσθενεῖς in *Epist.* 6. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 25 (W. H.) ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν κ.τ.λ., remembering Polycarp's fondness for 1 Peter (p. 76), and see Lightfoot on *Epist.* 6. Antiochus in *Hom.* 123 gets rid of the "inconsistency" by writing πεπλανημένα...ἀσθενῆ (p. 274), and thereby shews himself the later writer. The strayed sheep was a thoroughly familiar symbol, but it was usual to speak literally of οἱ ἀσθενεῖς.

[20] Zahn is first quoted as citing *Sim.* ix. 19, 2 ὑποκριταὶ κ.τ.λ. ὄνομα μὲν ἔχουσιν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς πίστεως κενοί εἰσι, with the remark, "Ad hunc locum Polycarpus respexisse mihi videtur, praesertim cum vox κενός facile eum traducere potuerit ad...αὐτὸς γὰρ κενὸς ὢν κ.τ.λ." (*Mand.* xi. 3).

ἐν ὑποκρίσει φερόντων τὸ ὄνομα] Hermas writes on "wearing" the Name while "denying the power thereof" in *Sim.* ix. 13, 2 sq. *ἐὰν τὸ ὄνομα φορῇς, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν μὴ φορῇς αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.*, and writes in *Vis.* iii. 6, 1 *ἐπίστευσαν δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει.* Thus again a single clause from Polycarp may have contributed to a plurality of sayings in Hermas (p. 79). On the "empty" compare also *Mand.* xii. 5, 3 *ταχὺ γὰρ τὰ ἀπόκενα κεράμια ὀξίζουσι.*

ὅτι πάντες] The word "all" is Polycarpian: it occurs 8 times in the 16 lines of chap. 4 (ed. Lightfoot), and frequently elsewhere. Here it gives the emphasis, "All, not excepting ourselves who are judges of others, *ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας*," and we may think that Antiochus who omits *πάντες* is the later writer. Notice the opening words of the *Epistle*, Πολύκαρπος *καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι*, on which Bp Lightfoot well remarks, "Polycarp evidently writes here as a bishop (*ἐπίσκοπος*) in the later and fuller sense of the title, surrounded by his council of presbyters." If after this he does not harp upon the dignity of his office, as if it had been called in question, his "quietness and confidence" are signs of strength and assurance.

ὀφειλέται ἁμαρτίας] This phrase would have attracted the attention of Hermas if he used the *Epistle*, but he may have thought it represented nearly enough by his *ἔνοχος ἁμαρτίας* [Mark iii. 29 *ἁμαρτήματος*] in *Mand.* ii. 2 and *Mand.* iv. 1, 5.

πιστεύοντες κατά] This phrase also may have been in the mind of Hermas when he wrote *Mand.* ii. 2 *πρῶτον μὲν μηδενὸς καταλάλει, μηδὲ ἡδέως ἄκουε καταλαλοῦντος· εἰ δὲ μή, καὶ σὺ ὁ ἀκούων ἔνοχος ἔσῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ καταλαλοῦντος, ἐὰν* πιστεύσῃς *τῇ καταλαλιᾷ ᾗ ἂν ἀκούσῃς· πιστεύσει γὰρ καὶ σὺ αὐτὸς ἕξεις κατα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σοῦ. οὕτως οὖν ἔνοχος ἔσῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ καταλαλοῦντος.* Contrast the sense of *καταπιστεύουσα ἑαυτῇ* in *Mand.* ix. 10.

ἀπέναντι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] The Church personified concludes her address to her *τέκνα*, the presbyters, in Hermas *Vis.* iii. 9, 10 with the words *ἵνα κἀγὼ κατέναντι τοῦ πατρὸς ἱλαρὰ σταθεῖσα λόγον ἀποδῶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν πάντων τῷ Κυρίῳ ὑμῶν.*

Epist. 7 *καὶ προσκαρτεροῦντες νηστείαις, δεήσεσιν αἰτού-*

μενοι τὸν παντεπόπτην Θεὸν [Clem. R. 64] *κ.τ.λ. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.*

Cf. Herm. *Vis.* iii. 10, 6 *πᾶσα ἐρώτησις ταπεινοφροσύνης χρῄζει·* ΝΗΣΤΕΥΣΟΝ *οὖν καὶ λήμψῃ ὃ αἰτεῖς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου.* 7 *καὶ λέγει μοι·* "Οτι *σὺ ὑπὸ χεῖρα* ΑΙΤΕΙΣ *ἀποκαλύψεις* ΕΝ ΔΕΗΣΕΙ, *βλέπε μήποτε πολλὰ αἰτούμενος* ΒΛΑΨΗΣ ΣΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΣΑΡΚΑ.

Epist. 8 *καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.*

Cf. Herm. *Sim.* ix. 28, 5 *ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ πάσχοντες ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος δοξάζειν ὀφείλετε τὸν Θεόν.* *Sim.* vi. 3, 6 *καὶ τότε δοξάζουσι τὸν Κύριον ὅτι ἐμοὶ παρεδόθησαν, καὶ οὐκέτι οὐδὲν πάσχουσι τῶν πονηρῶν.*

Epist. 9 *καὶ ὅτι εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον αὐτοῖς τόπον εἰσὶ παρὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ, ᾧ καὶ συνέπαθον.*

Supposing this to refer to Clem. Rom. 5 *ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης* and Rom. viii. 17 *εἴπερ συνπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν*, it serves as a good example of Polycarp's allusive way of referring to and combining his authorities without formal citation. Undue stress has been laid on the "profuseness of quotations" arising from "want of originality" in his *Epistle* (p. 284). When it is compared with those of Ignatius, allowance must be made for the outward circumstances which supplied Ignatius with his most striking and seemingly original thoughts: when it is compared with the *Epistle of Barnabas* with its three chapters from the *Two Ways*, or with St Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians*, it at once appears that these are no less profuse in citations, and further that they abound in continuous extracts, which point more distinctly to "want of originality" than the short, passing allusions to Scripture in Polycarp. Take for example Clement's chap. 18, the first four lines of which in Bp Lightfoot's edition are, Τί δὲ εἴπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυείδ; *πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Θεός,* Εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαγεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν. *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει πρὸς τὸν Θεόν·* Ἐλέησον. Then follow 27 lines of quotation—"The 51st Psalm quoted from the LXX almost word for word. The variations are very slight and unimportant"—to the end of the

chapter, which thus consists of 31 lines, all but about two of which are "reproduced with little or no modification" from the Old Testament.

τόπον] Cf. Herm. *Sim.* ix. 27, 3 *ὁ τόπος αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων*: *Vis.* iii. 1, 9 *ὁ εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τόπος.*

Epist. 10 *Cum potestis benefacere.* nolite differre...et Dominus in vobis non blasphemetur.

benefacere] Cf. Herm. *Sim.* x. 4, 4 facite igitur opera bona, quicunque accepistis [bonum] a Domino, ne dum tardamini facere consummetur structura turris.

blasphemetur] Cf. Herm. *Vis.* ii. 2, 2 *τὸ σπέρμα σου.. ἐβλασφήμησαν εἰς τὸν Κύριον.* Cf. *Sim.* vi. 2, 3—4. *Sim.* viii. 6, 4 *βλασφημήσαντες ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν τὸν Κύριον. Sim.* ix. 19, 3 *ὅτι οὐκ ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν Κύριον αὐτῶν.*

Epist. 11 Qui autem non potest se in his gubernare, quomodo alii pronuntiat hoc? Si quis non se abstinuerit ab avaritia, ab idololatria coinquinabitur...beatus Paulus &c. *de vobis* etenim *gloriatur in* omnibus *ecclesiis*, quae solae tunc Dominum cognoverant...sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos revocate.

"Qui autem non potest se &c." has a parallel in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 9, 10 *πῶς ὑμεῖς παιδεύειν θέλετε τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς Κυρίου. αὐτοὶ μὴ ἔχοντες παιδείαν;* With "gubernare" compare *διακυβερνῶν* in *Sim.* viii. 3, 3.

coinquinabitur] Notice the remarkable use of *μιαίνειν* in Herm. *Mand.* iii. 2 *ἐμίαναν τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀποστερηταί*: *Sim.* ix. 29, 2 *ἐν οὐδενὶ πράγματι ἐμίαναν τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

revocate] *Epist.* 6 *ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα.* Cf. Herm. *Mand.* viii. 10 *ἐσκανδαλισμένους ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως μὴ ἀποβάλλεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπιστρέφειν.*

de vobis] Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, quotes from 2 Thess. i. 4 *ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ*, as if these words of St Paul were addressed to them. Bp Lightfoot here simply quotes 2 Thess. i. 4, and in vol. i. (p. 584, ed. 2) he remarks, "It is a hyperbole—though a very natural hyperbole—to say that he boasts of the

Philippians in all the churches." Due allowance being made for Polycarp's predilection for the word "all" (p. 93), I venture to doubt whether he is justly chargeable with exaggeration, when St Paul himself wrote to the Philippians (Phil. ii. 15, 16), *ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες, εἰς καύχημα ἐμοὶ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ.* If they were as *φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ* the Apostle might be said to boast of them [Phil. *καύχημα*] *ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις* without "hyperbole" on the part of Polycarp. The most that can be said is that this writer used a wrong text to express what St Paul had written to the Philippians. Such error, or apparent error[21], is a mark of genuineness in the *Epistle*, as being of the sort which a forger could most easily have avoided.

The argument on the other side is as follows (p. 255): "In *Hom.* 58 Antiochus warns his readers against exulting over the fall of any one, and then in *Hom.* 59 urges them *συγχαίρειν τοῖς εὖ βιοῦσιν*, and says *καθὼς καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, συγχαίρων τισίν, ἔλεγεν· ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.* (2 Thess. i. 4). *Ὁμοίως καὶ Φιλιπ-πησίοις*, stringing together *with this ascription*, Phil. ii. 17, 18; 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26 &c....However it is to be explained, the connexion here between the *Homilies* and the *Epistle* is evident." This connexion consists in "a curious likeness of mind between the two writers" (p. 257)—so curious that it goes far to prove that the two writers are one.

Granted that the alleged connexion between *Hom.* 59 and the *Epistle* exists, we find the *Epistle* seeming to say of the blessed Paul that he wrote 2 Thess. i. 4 to the Philippians, while the homilist says that the blessed Paul wrote these words to certain persons (*τισίν*), and wrote other words to the Philippians. Thus he corrects the apparent error of Polycarp by saying that 2 Thess. i. 4 was addressed to certain persons *not* the Philippians. The obvious inference is that Antiochus is distinct from and of later date than Polycarp.

avaritia] Another example of this "likeness of mind"

[21] Polycarp, who begins his *Epistle* with an allusion to Phil. ii. 17 (Cotterill, p. 257), would have known the preceding verses as addressed by St Paul to the Philippians, but may have preferred "*ecclesiis*" to *ἐν κόσμῳ*.

between Antiochus and Polycarp is detected in their teachings on *φιλαργυρία*. "The Greek word is here [*Epist.* 11] certainly *φιλαργυρία*, but it is *πλεονεξία* that S. Paul (Col. iii. 5, Ephes. v. 5) calls idolatry... *Hom.* 8, which is *περὶ φιλαργυρίας*, distinctly describes this vice as idolatry...not quoting S. Paul's words, which Antiochus does not use until he comes to *Hom.* 13 *περὶ πλεονεξίας*" (p. 257).

The argument is that Antiochus, *like Polycarp*, "distinctly describes *φιλαργυρία* as idolatry," and that he speaks thus of *φιλαργυρία* to the comparative neglect of St Paul's saying that *πλεονεξία* is idolatry.

But (i) Polycarp, as we have seen (p. 82), does not distinctly describe *φιλαργυρία* as idolatry. He only says that the *φιλάργυρος* "ab idololatria coinquinabitur, et tanquam inter gentes judicabitur," regarding the love of money as an *ἀρχὴ χαλεπῶν* (*Epist.* 4). The nearest parallel which Mr Cotterill can find in Antiochus is the saying in *Hom.* 8 (1456 D) *λέγει ἡ γραφή· Ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ποιῶν εἴδωλον, καὶ τιθεὶς ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ. ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ ἔχων φιλαργυρίας πάθος...ἀγαλματοφορεῖ φαντασίαν πλούτου*, where the writer says something different from Polycarp in a form of words not in the least resembling his.

And (ii) as to *πλεονεξία*, Antiochus in *Hom.* 13 (1469 A) writes *οἱ γὰρ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν κ.τ.λ.* (1 Tim. vi. 9) *κατὰ τὸν Ἀπόστολον. καὶ αὖθις παραγγέλλει φεύγειν τὴν πλεονεξίαν· ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία*: and in *Hom.* 130 (1841 D) *πλεονεξία, ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία· φιλαργυρία, ἡ ῥίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν* (1 Tim. vi. 10), *φιλοκοσμία*. Thus he shews rather a predilection for the saying (not quoted by Polycarp) that *πλεονεξία* is idolatry.

Lastly, when in *Hom.* 130, with reference perhaps to the *Epistle* of Polycarp (p. 88), he thus quotes 1 Tim. vi. 10 on *φιλαργυρία*, he does not adopt the Polycarpian form of it, which has *ἀρχὴ* for *ῥίζα* and *χαλεπῶν* for *κακῶν* (*Epist.* 4). In his treatment of the whole subject Antiochus is very successful in concealing his "curious likeness of mind" to Polycarp, and the two differ as much as any two Christian writers handling common material could be expected to differ.

Further attempts to make out a "marvellous likeness of mind" between Antiochus and Polycarp (p. 283) are equally strained and unsuccessful. On the Christian Ministry, as is well known, the language of Polycarp is in marked contrast with that of Ignatius. Antiochus shews himself Ignatian by his way of speaking in *Hom.* 122, Περὶ *ἀρχιερωσύνης*, where he "even coins the word *ἀρχιεράρχης*" for *ἐπίσκοπος* (p. 284); and in *Hom.* 124, Περὶ *τοῦ αἰδεῖσθαι ἱερεῖς*, which commences, Ὁ Θεοφόρος Ἰγνάτιος *ἐπιστέλλει, λέγων· Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, ἵνα καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.*, where few will accept the ingenious suggestion that the writer names Ignatius[22] "as if to free himself from the charge" (p. 283) of adopting his language. It was natural that he should name Ignatius, one of his principal authorities, somewhere, as in *Hom.* 130 (1845 C) he names Ἀθανάσιος, Βασίλειος, Γρηγόριος, Ἰωάννης, *καὶ* Κύριλλος, *ὁ τῆς* Ἀλεξανδρέων *μεγαλοπόλεως.*

He *does* mention (p. 283) Baptism in *Hom.* 77, Περὶ *μετανοίας*, thus, *καὶ τὴν πρώτην στολὴν τῆς ἀθανασίας, καὶ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας, ἣν ἐνεδύθημεν διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος* (1660 A); and in *Hom.* 80, Περὶ *ὁμονοίας*, he has an Ignatian passage on unity, including the idea of *ἓν θυσιαστήριον* (1673 B), which Ignat. *Phil.* 4 associates with *μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ.*

To conclude, I can find no evidence of the alleged remarkable likeness of mind, pointing to identity between the homilist and Polycarp, in the select instances adduced to prove it; and in some of these, and elsewhere in the *Homilies*, I find evidence to the contrary.

Epist. 12 Confido enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis, et nihil vos latet; mihi autem non est concessum... Jesu Christi et ipse sempiternus pontifex...Orate enim *pro regibus* et potestatibus et principibus...ut fructus vester *manifestus sit in omnibus.*

non est concessum] Cf. *Epist.* 3 *οὐκ ἐμαυτῷ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω ὑμῖν.* Herm. *Vis.* ii. 4, 3 *ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται*, with reference "sacris literis," as in *Epist.* 12. Hermas in *Vis.* ii. 1,

[22] "For the first and only time in the *Homilies*." Thus he gives all the weight he can to the sayings quoted. Compare note 26.

4 is unable to read the book: he says, *μετεγραψάμην πάντα πρὸς γράμμα· οὐχ ηὕρισκον γὰρ τὰς συλλαβάς.*

sempiternus pontifex] A phrase preserved in one of the Syriac extracts from the *Epistle* (p. 104).

pro regibus &c.] Jacobson and others cite 1 Tim. ii. 1 *παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς,* ἐντεύξεις, *εὐχαριστίας,* ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, 2 *pro regibus et omnibus qui in sublimitate sunt*, in reply to the trivial objection that "pro regibus" must date from a time when two "reges" were associated in the government. I mention this here for the sake of the further remark that ἐντεύξεις ὑπὲρ πάντων, from the same passage, seems to be referred to in *Epist.* 4 *ἐντυγχανούσας περὶ πάντων* (p. 79).

fructus manifestus] So Herm. *Sim.* iv. 3 *ὥσπερ γὰρ τῷ θέρει ἑνὸς ἑκάστου δένδρου οἱ καρποὶ φανεροῦνται καὶ ἐπιγινώσκονται ποταποί εἰσιν, οὕτω καὶ τῶν δικαίων* οἱ καρποὶ φανεροὶ ἔσονται, *καὶ γνωσθήσονται πάντες.*

Epist. 14 ...conversatus est enim nobiscum inculpabiliter, credo autem quia et vobiscum similiter.

Cf. Clem. Rom. 63 *ἀναστραφέντας ἀμέμπτως ἐν ὑμῖν.* Herm. *Sim.* ix. 27, 2 *ἁγνῶς ἀνεστράφησαν*: *Vis.* iv. 2, 5 *ἀμέμπτως.*

IV. *Clement of Rome and Polycarp.*

1.

Mr Cotterill in *Peregrinus Proteus* (1879) undertakes to prove that St Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* and some other writings supposed to be ancient were forged at a late date, Henry Stephens (A.D. 1528—1598) being "an accessory after the fact certainly, possibly one of the principals" (p. 320). "We have traced them (he says) down to the fifteenth century ...We have shown, we think conclusively, the existence of a great literary fraud, and have given good reason for supposing that it was committed in the times of the revival of learning" (p. 293).

The *Epistle* of Clement is found in the Codex Alexandrinus, in the Bryennius manuscript, and in a Syriac manuscript which claims to be of the twelfth century, all three of which must have been written in the fifteenth century or later if the case against the *Epistle* is made out. Mr Cotterill in 1879 thought his argument strong enough to override this objection; and he was still of that opinion when he wrote the Introduction to *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins* (1884).

But in the article on Polycarp (p. 260), unless he tacitly assumes a modern date for "Antiochus" also, he has receded from this extreme position; for he now considers it "evident that the writer of the *Epistle*"—that is, probably Antiochus himself (p. 65)—had in mind Clem. Rom. 17 *κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· λέγομεν δὲ Ἠλίαν...τοὺς προφήτας...Ἰὼβ δὲ ΗΝ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΜΕΜΠΤΟΣ...ΑΠΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΠΟ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΚΑΚΟΥ*, when he wrote *Epist.* 5—6 *καὶ οἱ προφῆται οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.* "This coincidence (he adds) seems to have escaped the notice of the editors of the *Epistle*." Clem. Rom. I. is thus allowed to have preceded the *Homilies* of Antiochus. From my own study of it I have been led to think that it was known to Hermas[23].

Assuming that Polycarp borrowed from Clement, we may think that he did so in the following cases:

C. 1 *τίς γὰρ παρεπιδημήσας πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὴν πανάρετον καὶ βεβαίαν ὑμῶν πίστιν οὐκ ἐδοκίμασεν;* C. 22 *βεβαιοῖ... πίστις.*

P. 1 *ὅτι ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ῥίζα κ.τ.λ.*

On *πανάρετον* in the first passage see note 16.

C. 1 *ὑποτασσόμενοι κ.τ.λ. τοῖς...πρεσβυτέροις· νέοις τε μέτρια καὶ σεμνὰ νοεῖν ἐπετρέπετε. γυναιξίν τε ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ σεμνῇ καὶ ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει κ.τ.λ. στεργούσας καθηκόντως τοὺς ἄνδρας ἑαυτῶν κ.τ.λ.* Compare C. 21.

P. 4 *τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν...στεργούσας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἄνδρας.*

[23] Notes of the argument have as yet been communicated only to Dr Gifford, who writes under date the 22nd April, 1891, "I have read your notes through carefully, and think you have proved beyond doubt that Hermas was well acquainted with Clement's Epistle."

P. 5 *ὁμοίως καὶ νεώτεροι κ.τ.λ. ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις κ.τ.λ. τὰς παρθένους ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει περιπατεῖν.*

Here Polycarp works up C. 1, applying *ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει* to *παρθένοι* instead of *γυναῖκες*: advice for young men precedes in each case.

C. 19 *ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ.*

P. 2 Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας [1 Pet. i. 13] δουλεύσατε τῷ Θεῷ ἐν φόβῳ [Ps. ii. 11] *καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* [C. 19].

There is some confusion in the attempt to shew that the writer of the *Epistle* copied from the *Homilies* in this case, for in "Antiochus (*sic*) begins § 2 by saying &c. In § 6 he returns to this and says &c." (p. 265), the references are to chaps. 2 and 6 of the *Epistle*, and not to the *Homilies*. On the other hand the case for the priority of *Epist.* 2 from Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι onwards is a strong one:

(i) The combination of *ἀναζωσάμενοι κ.τ.λ.* and *δουλεύσατε κ.τ.λ.* is Polycarpian (p. 94) and in itself natural, one of the things connoted by *girding* being *service*, as in Herm. *Sim.* viii. 4, 1 *περίζωσαι ὠμόλινον, καὶ διακόνει μοι.*

(ii) Successive references in *Epist.* 1—2 to 1 Pet. i. 8, 13, 21; iii. 9 give unity to the whole context, and indicate its originality as against the *Homilies*. Also 1 Pet. i. 21 *πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα κ.τ.λ.* leads up to *ὁ δὲ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ* (2 Cor. iv. 14), to which corresponds the balanced phrase καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ ἠγάπησεν (p. 85). Polycarp, here and in *Epist.* 12, may have been influenced by Ign. *Trall.* 9 *ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ὁμοίωμα ὃς* (*sic*) *καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ οὕτως ἐγερεῖ κ.τ.λ.*

(iii) Antiochus writes in the present tense *καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ αὐτὸς ἀγαπᾷ* (p. 85), for ἃ ἠγάπησεν, thus missing the point of the phrase and making it mean merely *τὰ εὐάρεστα αὐτῷ*. Polycarp (like 1 Peter) refers to the example of Christ: "If we love the things which He *loved*, being far from all sin [*Epist.* 3] as He was far from all sin, then ὁ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ." Antiochus was clearly the later writer.

C. 23 *πόρρω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν.* C. 30 *ἀπὸ παντὸς ψιθυρισμοῦ καὶ καταλαλιᾶς πόρρω ἑαυτοὺς ποιοῦντες.*

P. 4 *μακρὰν πάσης καταλαλιᾶς κ.τ.λ.*

The Polycarpian μακράν may have been suggested in part by Clement's πόρρω. Notice that for *Did.* v., *ὧν μακρὰν πραΰτης καὶ ὑπομονή*, *Epist. Barn.* 20 has *ὧν μακρὰν καὶ πόρρω κ.τ.λ.*, comparing in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 6, 1 *μακρὰν ῥιπτομένους...πόρρω ἀπερίφησαν.* It would be very hard to prove that such a phrase as "far from all sin" was first used by so late a writer as Antiochus (p. 265). Why should it not have been used by Polycarp—notice his "all" (p. 93)—whether he coined or borrowed it? Farness from transgression is a commonplace in Rabbinic, in connexion with the saying "make a fence to the Torah." Almost at the beginning of the Mishnah we find "to make-far from transgression," and in *Pirke Aboth* vi. 1 "he loves God, loves the creatures...and it makes-him-far from sin."

C. 27 *ὁ παραγγείλας μὴ ψεύδεσθαι...αὐτὸς οὐ ψεύσεται.*

P. 11 ...quomodo alii pronuntiat hoc? (p. 95).

C. 41 *οὐ πανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσίαι...ἀλλ' ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον.*

P. 4 *τὰς χήρας...γινωσκούσας ὅτι εἰσὶ θυσιαστήριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅτι πάντα μωμοσκοπεῖται.*

Polycarp's *γινωσκούσας ὅτι* perhaps points to the previous currency of the saying[24]. Of later writers it was known to Tertullian. In *Apost. Const.* it is quoted apparently from Polycarp, as *γνωριζέτω ὅτι* (p. 90) suggests, and as Cotelier supposed; the elaboration of the context in another passage (p. 282) indicating again that *Apost. Const.* was not the primary authority for the saying. Antiochus would have known it, although he does not refer to it in its Polycarpian form. He cites the parallel passage from Hermas, as was remarked in note 13, and he has an adaptation of the saying, as below, near the end of *Hom.* 120: *ἐξαιρέτως δὲ οἱ μοναχοὶ χρεῶσταί*

[24] Compare *εἰδότες ὅτι* in *Epist.* 1 (ed. Lightfoot). Under *Epist.* 4 in the same edition see citations of the saying by Tertullian and others.

εἰσιν προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ...πνευματικὰς θυσίας, αἷς καὶ μᾶλλον χαίρει ὁ Θεός· ὁλοκαύτωσον σεαυτὸν ὅλον τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ βωμῶν ἐξομολογήσεως καὶ δακρύων, ὅπερ σημαίνει, Βόας μετὰ χειμάρρων. *Διὰ καθαρᾶς προσευχῆς, ὅπερ ἐστὶν τὸ θυμίαμα, προσένεγκαι αὐτῷ τὸ στηθήνιον (sic), τὸ θυμικόν, καὶ τὸν λοβὸν τοῦ ἤπατος, τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, καὶ τοὺς δύο νεφρούς, τὴν σωφροσύνην· κεφαλὴν σὺν τοῖς ποσίν, τὸν ἡγεμόνα νοῦν σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν τῆς εἰς ζωὴν φερούσης ὁδοῦ. Πᾶσαν ἔννοιαν, πᾶσαν πρᾶξιν καὶ κίνησιν καὶ θεωρίαν ἀνάθου τῷ Θεῷ ἐν πνεύματι συντετριμμένῳ καὶ τεταπεινωμένῳ. Ἐὰν οὕτως ὁλοκαυτώσῃς σεαυτὸν τῷ Θεῷ, ἀποκαθαίρῃ μὲν τὰς λέπρας τῶν ἀκαθάρτων παθῶν, γίνῃ δὲ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ναὸς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κ.τ.λ.*

Here *θυσιαστήριον καὶ* is interpolated in a wholly different saying *γίνῃ δὲ ναὸς κ.τ.λ.* (p. 85), *monks* take the place of *widows*, and the passage generally is marked by an elaboration wholly foreign to the simplicity of the *Epistle* of Polycarp. The saying in the *Epistle* comes in quite naturally as suggested by Clement's *πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον.*

C. 53 *ἐπίστασθε γὰρ καὶ καλῶς ἐπίστασθε τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς, ἀγαπητοί, καὶ ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

P. 12 Confido enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis. P. 3 *εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε.* P. 7 *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου.*

Other parallels are pointed out in the commentaries, or may be easily found.

2.

Mr Cotterill's *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins*[25] (1884) is a work of like character with the article on Polycarp. In it he announces the important discovery that the *Homilies* of Antiochus contain the Greek of great part of the *Epistles to Virgins*, which had been known only in Syriac, and then argues "that these *Epistles* followed, not preceded, the *Homilies*." It is necessary to state that this result is not accepted by other writers, because Mr Cotterill simply refers to

[25] The *Epistles to Virgins* are allowed to be not in reality Clement's, but they are generally believed to be of very early date.

it as proved, and then uses it to weaken the testimony of the Syriac extracts from Polycarp (p. 252). The fact remains that these vouch for several of the most striking passages in his *Epistle*. They are Nos. 19, 22, 23 in Lightfoot's *Quotations and References* (vol. i. 563—66):

No. 19, from Timotheus of Alexandria, is from *Epist.* 11, "But God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Chief-priest of eternity Himself, God Jesus Christ, (shall) build you up in faith and in truth and in all meekness."

No. 22, from Severus of Antioch, contains the same with some additional words; and an extract from *Epist.* 5, "In the same manner deacons blameless before His righteousness are deacons of God and Christ and not of man."

No. 23, anonymous, contains *Epist.* 7 down to *μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν*, and an extract from *Epist.* 12, "Be ye praying for all the saints and for kings and rulers and for princes, and for those that hate us and persecute us, and for the enemies of the Cross of Christ."

V. *Ignatius and Polycarp.*

Polycarp's *Epistle* [P.] is related to the *Epistles* of Ignatius in a way consistent with the hypothesis of its genuineness. Some things in it are compared below with parallels in the several chapters of the *Epistle to Polycarp*, but the comparison is not intended to be exhaustive:

chap. i. **1** *ἡδρασμένην ὡς ἐπὶ πέτραν ἀκίνητον.* iii. **1** *στῆθι ἑδραῖος*: P. 10 state...firmi in fide et immutabiles. **2** *ἐκδίκει σου τὸν τόπον*: P. 11 quod sic ignoret is locum qui datus est ei. *ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιμελείᾳ*: P. 5 *ἐπιμελεῖς*.

chap. ii. **3** *ὡς κυβερνῆται ἀνέμους*: P. 11 gubernare, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 28 *κυβερνήσεις, gubernationes.* See Lightfoot on subsequent elaborations of the simile, noticing the cognate metaphor in 1 Tim. i. 19 *περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν.* **3** *τὰ δεσμά μου ἃ ἠγάπησας*: P. 1 *ἁγιοπρεπέσιν δεσμοῖς κ.τ.λ.*

chap. iii. **1** *πάντα ὑπομενεῖν ἡμᾶς δεῖ* (1 Cor. xiii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 10). **2** *τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπο-*

μείναντα. vi. 2 *ἡ ὑπομονὴ ὡς πανοπλία*: P. 1 *ὃς ὑπέμεινεν* κ.τ.λ. P. 8 *δι' ἡμᾶς...πάντα ὑπέμεινεν* κ.τ.λ. P. 12 et in patientia. P. 13 *τὰς ἐπιστολὰς Ἰγνατίου...περιέχουσι γὰρ πίστιν καὶ ὑπομονήν*. It was natural that the *Epistles* of Ignatius should abound in expressions inculcating endurance, and that Polycarp should take up the idea.

chap. iv. 1 *χῆραι μὴ ἀμελείσθωσαν*: P. 6 *μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χήρας*. Herm. *Mand.* viii. 10 *χήραις ὑπηρετεῖν*. *Sim.* i. 8 *καὶ μὴ παραβλέπετε*. 3 *δούλους καὶ δούλας μὴ ὑπερηφάνει* (1 Tim. vi. 2): P. 10 nullum despicientes.

chap. v. 1 *τὰς κακοτεχνίας φεῦγε, μᾶλλον δὲ περὶ τούτων ὁμιλίαν ποιοῦ*: P. 7 *καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας.. πρωτότοκός ἐστι τοῦ Σατανᾶ*. Herm. *Mand.* xi. 6 *τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐπερωτώμενον καὶ λαλοῦν κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων* κ.τ.λ. 17 *ἀπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου γὰρ ἔρχεται*. Hermas, from the nature of his allegory, could not speak in it expressly of the *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*, but he alludes in effect to the oracles of the false prophets, which were perversions of them.

chap. vi. 2 *ὡς ὅπλα* κ.τ.λ.: P. 4 *ὁπλισώμεθα τοῖς ὅπλοις* κ.τ.λ. The former passage is a striking one and would have made an impression on Polycarp. It is quoted by Antiochus in *Hom.* 92 (1713 D sq.).

Bp Lightfoot gives fourteen references by Antiochus to Ignatius (vol. i. 205 sq., *Quot. and Ref.* No 44), occupying in large type about four pages[26], and Mr Cotterill adds one from *Magn.* 9 (p. 241). Thanks to Mr Cotterill we now know that passages from the *Epistle* of Polycarp also are contained in the *Homilies*, and not only so, but that they use it more largely in proportion than they do the seven letters of Ignatius. Of the seven they make most use of the *Epistle to Polycarp*.

[26] Of the four pages scarcely more than five lines, from *τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε* to *χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε*, in the extract from *Hom.* 124, is printed as direct quotation (Lightfoot, p. 209). If in this case only Antiochus quotes Ignatius carefully and (as Mr Cotterill remarks) by name, it is because he thinks his sayings on the *ἐπίσκοπος* authoritative and of especial importance. See above, p. 98.

VI. *St John and the Robber.*

"In *Hom.* 122 Antiochus tells the story of St John and the robber. This narrative is given by Anastasius and by Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 23) out of Clement of Alexandria. Antiochus however ascribes it to Irenaeus. This false statement may be attributed to forgetfulness, or inadvertence—for the name of Irenaeus appears in Eusebius' context—or to a desire to mislead. Anastasius gives the narrative...from Clement of Alexandria" (Cotterill, pp. 279—80).

This raises a question about the history of the narrative, which was not invented by Clem. Alex., although he may have been the earliest literary authority for it. He tells the story, as an encouragement to true repentance, in *Quis div. salv.* 42, beginning *ἄκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, παραδεδομένον καὶ μνήμῃ πεφυλαγμένον.* St John comes from Patmos to Ephesus, and goes thence *ἐπί τινα τῶν οὐ μακρὰν πόλεων ἧς καὶ τοὔνομα λέγουσιν ἔνιοι* ["Smyrna erat, si Chron. Alexandr. fides. *Fell.*" (Potter, p. 959)]. If it was told with variations it was already no new story when Clement wrote it down.

St John (the story continues) entrusted a promising young man to the care of the bishop of the place, with the words *τοῦτον παρατίθεμαι κ.τ.λ.* He after the youth's baptism *ὑφῆκε τῆς πλείονος ἐπιμελείας καὶ παραφυλακῆς.* The youth fell into evil companionships and became a captain of brigands. St John after a while came again and said, *ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἀπόδος ἡμῖν, ἣν ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ σοι παρακατεθέμεθα ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἧς προκαθέζῃ, μάρτυρος.* He not understanding what "deposit" was meant, St John said *τὸν νεανίσκον ἀπαιτῶ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ.* The bishop *ἐκεῖνος, ἔφη, τέθνηκε. Πῶς, καὶ τίνα θάνατον; Θεῷ τέθνηκεν.* The literary point of the story is in the paradoxical use of *παρακαταθήκη*, to denote a person or *ψυχή*.

Antiochus uses the story to illustrate the responsibilities of the true *ποιμήν*, and at the end of it he quotes Herm. *Sim.* ix. 31 on false and careless "pastores." A curious parable—quoted

in Ant. *Hom.* 94 (1720 B, C)—follows in Hermas: "si enim dederis fulloni vestimentum novum integrum, idque integrum iterum vis recipere, fullo autem si scissum tibi reddat, recipies illud? nonne &c." To this corresponds *Mand.* iii. 2 *οἱ οὖν ψευδόμενοι ἀθετοῦσι τὸν Κύριον καὶ γίνονται ἀποστερηταὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, μὴ παραδιδόντες αὐτῷ τὴν παρακαταθήκην, ἣν ἔλαβον, ἔλαβον γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἄψευστον κ.τ.λ.* This has led me to speculate on the possibility of the story having been known to Hermas. His knowledge of it would have accounted for his peculiar use of *παρακαταθήκη* to denote the "spirit" of a man ["St John" *ψυχήν*], for his use of *ἀποστερηταί* in the immediate context, and for his concluding with the subject of repentance from great depravity, on condition of which *δυνήσῃ σεαυτῷ ζωὴν περιποιήσασθαι. καὶ ὃς ἂν ἀκούσῃ κ.τ.λ. ζήσεται τῷ Θεῷ* [cf. *Θεῷ τέθνηκεν*]. His parable of the neglected vine, which *ἀμελείας τυγχάνουσα...ἀγρία γίνεται* (*Sim.* ix. 26, 4; *Mand.* x. 1, 5), bears a striking likeness to the story of the Robber.

Clement in telling the story brings in phrases from the *Shepherd of Hermas*, with which he was familiar; but he makes it appear that the word *παρακαταθήκη* and the play upon it belonged to the tradition as he had received it.

VII. *Summary.*

At the end of the argument against the *Epistle* of Polycarp we read (p. 284): "Of the foregoing pages then this is the sum. When the *Homilies* and the *Epistle* are placed side by side and tested by the method laid down by Bishop Lightfoot for determining which of two writings is the earlier, it appears that the *Homilies* preceded the *Epistle*." It is however Mr Cotterill who has laid down this method for the Bishop, generalising from a single instance, and remarking, "The pity is that he so seldom made use of it" (p. 250). Mr Cotterill's formula is a mere fallacy: it is briefly, that a writing which again and again "explains" another must have preceded it,

when it is obvious that a writing may be explained in one sense of the term by a later, and in another by an earlier writing. In particular, given that a writing explains a later writing, it does not follow that a third which explains the second *by means of the first* [see next paragraph] is likewise earlier than the second. This form of the fallacy is most to be shunned. In cases in which the *Epistle* is said to be "illustrated or explained" by the *Homilies* (p. 252), it has been found either that the *Epistle* is not so explained in the required sense, or that the *Epistle* explains the *Homilies*.

Polycarp's "every *ἐπιθυμία wars* against the *spirit*" (p. 70) is explained and accounted for by 1 Pet. ii. 11 στρατεύονται *κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς* and Gal. v. 17 *ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ* πνεύματος. It follows that these preceded the *Epistle*, but not that a writing which uses them to explain the *Epistle* preceded it. Let the reader judge from Bp Lightfoot's words on Ign. *Smyrn.* 10 what he would have inferred in this case: "*οὐκ ἐπησχύνθητε*] Suggested by 2 Tim. i. 16 *τὴν ἅλυσίν μου οὐκ ἐπησχύνθη* (see the note on *Ephes.* 2). *The interpolator has seen the parallel and introduced the context of S. Paul into the context of Ignatius.*" So Antiochus, having seen the allusion to Is. lviii. 7 in a passage of Hermas (note 13), has quoted it to illustrate the passage. The method used against the *Epistle* would make this evidence that Antiochus preceded Hermas.

Epist. 5 is "explained" by making *ἄτοπον ποιεῖν* mean the same there as in *Hom.* 123 (p. 70): but it is admitted (p. 91) that this (to speak plainly) "makes nonsense": we must therefore look out another meaning for the phrase in our vocabulary. When the right meaning is found the *Epistle* explains the *Homilies:* the whole passage *καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι κ.τ.λ.* had made an impression on Antiochus: he quotes from it (p. 69), though not in *Hom.* 123 where he does not want it: then in *Hom.* 123 he uses *ἄτοπον ποιεῖν* in a sense which suits the context.

The copyist is apt to betray himself most completely by slight errors of inadvertence. Compare *περὶ πάντας εὔσπλαγχνοι* in *Hom.* 123 (p. 91), which is explained by *περὶ πάντα, εὔσπλαγχνοι* in *Epist.* 5. An equally clear case

is *ἀγαπῶμεν ἃ αὐτὸς ἀγαπᾷ*, which is explained as a misunderstanding of *ἀγαπῶμεν ἅ ἠγάπησεν* in *Epist.* 2 (p. 101). Of cases in which the *Epistle* has an idea in an early, and the *Homilies* in a late form, notice χήρας *θυσιαστήριον κ.τ.λ.* in *Epist.* 4, and *γύνη θυσιαστήριον* addressed by Antiochus the Monk to *monks* in *Hom.* 120 (p. 103).

To pass from details, Mr Cotterill aims at proving (i) that the 130 *Homilies* of Antiochus, a seventh century collector of Scriptural and other *loci communes*, contain materials out of which the *Epistle* might conceivably have been written (p. 265); and (ii) that the homilist is so like-minded with "Polycarp" that he might very well have composed his *Epistle*. It is of course easy to prove (i) more or less completely, and we may think that some of the said materials were drawn from the *Epistle* itself and some from writers who had used it before Antiochus: the argument for (ii) has been examined (pp. 96—98), and I can find no trace at all of the alleged likeness of mind between the two writers.

Against the evidence to shew that Antiochus was the copyist, and that he used the *Epistle* of Polycarp as he used that of Ignatius to Polycarp (p. 105), is set the opinion that there is nothing in the contents of the former to explain the homilist's supposed "lively interest in it" (p. 66). But the unexpected fact has to be accounted for that the *Homilies* contain more in proportion from this *Epistle* than from those of Ignatius (p. 105); and the argument against the *Epistle* requires us to think either that Antiochus wrote all that is common to the *Homilies* and the *Epistle* twice over (p. 69), or that he thought it worth composing (p. 67) and "his copyist" (p. 65) thought it worth copying.

The *Epistle* as we have seen contains striking sayings which have left their mark on literature, including one at least which is also of theological interest. There is no reason why such a document should not have been quoted by Antiochus, nor any proof that his apparent quotations from it are not what they seem. None the less, our thanks are due to Mr Cotterill for a substantial addition to our knowledge by his discovery, and

for fresh light thrown upon the *Epistle* in the course of his argument.

But it was the question of its relation to the *Shepherd of Hermas* which most of all moved me to write this article, and I must now leave the reader to form his judgment on the many parallels between the *Epistle of Polycarp* and that work.

C. TAYLOR.

Cambridge, 1891.

SOPH. O. T. 846. *οἰόζωνον* not a *separable* epithet.

In Professor Jebb's edition of the (Ed. Tyr., l. 846, occurs the note:

> *οἰόζωνον*, journeying alone. The peculiarity of the idiom is that the second part of the compound is equivalent to a separate epithet for the word; *i.e.* 'with solitary girdle' signifies 'alone,' and 'girt up.'

Some other instances are then suggested. In a note to my version of Sophocles I ventured to maintain, in opposition to Liddell and Scott, that *οἰόζωνος* is simply a poetical synonym for 'alone,' without connotation of the traveller's habit of girding up his loins; a singly-girdled man being the equivalent of 'the continent of a single girdle,' such as Waller had in view, in the lines

> Give me but what this girdle bound,
> Take all the rest the sun goes round.

I should like to expand this somewhat. The authorities quoted by Liddell and Scott are in reality authorities on the other side. Hesychius *s.v.* gives *μονόστολον* as an equivalent; and under that word he writes *τῷ κατὰ μόνας ἐλθόντι*. Suidas explains *μονοστόλῳ* as *μίαν στολὴν ἔχοντι*. Again, Suidas *s.v. μονόζωνοι* quotes the principal line with its *οἰόζωνον*, and adds *Ἔφοδοι βάρβαροι, ἢ ἀπελάται μάχιμοι*· in a word, raiders. Under a second entry the process is given by which this meaning was arrived at; *οἱ ἀσύντακτοι καὶ ὡσανεὶ λῃσταί*. Hesychius makes *μονόζωνοι οἱ τῶν πολεμίων κατάσκοποι· ἢ μάχιμοι, οὓς ἡμεῖς· Μονομάχους*. Skirmishers fight singly; scouts go spying singly; and every one who has a *ζώνη*, within which his whole company is comprised, is *μονόζωνος* and *μονόστολος* also, whether his dress be girt up, or trailing.

Ruhnken Ep. Crit. (p. 620 of the Leyden edition of 1823), commenting on Hermesianax Eleg. 7, writes "Hesych. *οἰόζωνον, μονόστολον,* quæ glossa pertinet ad Soph. O.T. 856, ubi Scholia explicant *μονόζωνον, μόνον.*" The word in Hermesianax is *μονόζωστος*, a very different form. In all this not only is there no authority for importing into *οἰόζωνος* the notion of '*girt up*,' but on the contrary, authority is unanimous the other way. Apart from authority—modesty becomes an amateur in scholarship; but I may perhaps be permitted to say—Sophocles, as a poet, was more likely to stick to his point, in this context, 'one man only, one individual I say,' than to confuse it by suggesting the idea of a particular garb. A whole treatise might be written on the special fitness of epithets in Sophocles to enhance his meaning.

Turning to Professor Jebb's other instances—I say it with diffidence,—they seem to me hardly strong enough to bear the weight of his theory. The hundred-footed Nereids, the crowded-winged nightingales, and other picturesque epithets applied to a plural number, are intelligible as regular compounds if the crowd is considered, as the eye of imagination should regard it, to be a single entity. It is worth notice that, upon the theory suggested, which makes the two parts of a compound epithet equivalent to two separate epithets, we should have one hundred Nereids, instead of fifty, for the galley to follow. The words quoted which are compounded with 'two' or 'twice' admit of a similar explanation; they are applied to a pair, which is regarded as one object. *κόρος μονόπαις* remains; but this Professor Jebb himself explains, not as 'alone' and also 'a boy'; but as 'his only child'; that is, the one half of the compound qualifies the other; they are not therefore separate epithets. Are there any other instances? *μονόζωστος*, in Hermesianax, may or may not be one. This point I am content to leave unargued. But I think further instances are wanted, before the theory in question can be considered established. And in any case I question its application to *οἰόζωνον* in Sophocles.

GEORGE YOUNG.

NOTES ON ALEXANDRA AND LITHICA.

Lycophronis Alexandra.

293. *ἀλλ' ὡς μέλισσαι συμπεφυρμένοι καπνῷ*
καὶ λιγνύος ῥιπαῖσι καὶ γρυνῶν βολαῖς
ἄφλαστα καὶ κόρυμβα καὶ κληδῶν θρόνους
πυκνοὶ κυβιστητῆρες ἐξ ἑδωλίων
πηδῶντες αἱμάξουσιν ὀθνείαν κόνιν.

These lines are explained by Bachmann with his usual confidence in a manner which I cannot but think absurd. Probably a line or more has dropt out before or after 295. Scheer has pointed out a similar lacuna after 185 and such writing as Lycophron's is certain to cause them. See below on 365 and 495.

312. *πρὸς τοῦ δαμέντος αὐτὸς οὐ τετρωμένος,*
καρατομηθεὶς τύμβον αἱμάξεις πατρός.

αὐτὸς is Troilus, *τοῦ δαμέντος* Achilles, subdued by love for Troilus. *τετρωμένος* is supposed to mean "wounded by love." But could even Lycophron say: "thou thyself, not wounded by the captive of thy charms, shalt—have thy head cut off by him"? The scholiast had no *οὐ* in his text. *ὁμοίως τὸ ἐν βρόχοις μάρψας ἀφύκτοις· οἱ γὰρ ἐρῶντες δίκην δεσμοῦ* (cp. schol. 704) *ἕλκονται πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωμένους. τῷ ἔρωτι οὖν τετρωμένος πρὸς τοῦ δαμέντος τῷ ἔρωτι Ἀχιλλέως κ.τ.λ.* This is nonsense as printed, but all required is to put a full stop after *οὖν*; then *τῷ ἔρωτι οὖν* sums up the explanation of *ἐν βρόχοις*.

and τετρωμένος begins a new note. The scholiast quoted by Sebastian certainly had no οὐ. Read then αὖ? "Thyself wounded in thy turn by him thou didst subdue."

365. μυρίων τέκνων
Ἑλλὰς στενάξει πᾶσα τοὺς κενοὺς τάφους,
οὐκ ὀστοθήκαις, χοιράδων δ' ἐφημένους,
οὐδ' ὑστάτην κεύθοντας ἐκ πυρὸς τέφρην
κρωσσοῖσι ταρχυθεῖσαν, ἣ θέμις φθιτῶν.

Has not something dropt out here again after ὀστοθήκαις? It is just possible to make the dative depend upon κεύθοντας, though I cannot believe that anybody would ever accuse a cenotaph of hiding ashes in a coffin. Of course we might read ὀστοθήκας, but that would be τὸν πόδα διώκοντος, for there would still be hopeless difficulties in the way. "Hellas shall lament cenotaphs, no true burial, but people sitting upon reefs," shall she? No, the original was something of this kind:

οὐκ ὀστοθήκαις ἀλλὰ γωλεοῖς νεκροὺς
σπίλων κελαινῶν χοιράδων δ' ἐγκειμένους.

For the general sense is plain enough. The shipwrecked Greeks shall lie not in tombs but among the rocks of the sea, nor shall their ashes be brought back in urns, the other kind of burial ἣ θέμις φθιτῶν. And look at the scholiast: οὐκ ἐν τοῖς τάφοις καὶ ταῖς ὀστοθήκαις κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τεθαμμένους, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς πέτραις. Had the writer of this our text before him? Kinkel has added κειμένους after πέτραις; this suggested to me ἐγκειμένους for ἐφημένους, which is intolerable. And the construction of ἐφημένους in the received text is another stumbling block. True, Liddell and Scott will straightway quote as parallel *Philoctetes* 1124;

καί που πολιᾶς
πόντου θινὸς ἐφήμενος,

but the presence of που there seems to me to make all the difference.

495. τοῦ ποτ' εἰς λέχος
λαθραῖον αὐτόκλητος Ἰδαία πόρις,
ἣ ζῶσ' ἐς Ἅιδην ἵξεται καταιβάτις,
θρήνοισιν ἐκτακεῖσα, Μουνίτου τοκάς.

As this manifestly will not construe at all, Scheer alters ἣ to ἡ, and is followed by Kinkel. Whoever will may be content with this; for my part, I prefer to regard this as another case of a lacuna; a line has dropt out after 495 or 496, probably the former.

ἡ ζῶσα ἐς Ἅιδην καταβησομένη is no doubt just such a phrase as Lycophron loves; but Scheer does not give us that; it cannot be got out of ἣ ζῶσ' ἐς Ἅιδην καταιβάτις.

788. ὃν Βομβυλείας κλιτὺς ἡ Τεμμικία
ὕψιστον ἡμῖν πῆμ' ἐτέκνωσέν ποτε,
μόνος πρὸς οἴκους ναυτίλων σωθεὶς τάλας.

A nice sentence truly. All required is to transpose 790 after 792. For he goes on:

λοίσθον δὲ καύηξ ὥστε κυμάτων δρομεύς,
ὡς κόγχος ἅλμῃ πάντοθεν περιτριβείς,
<μόνος πρὸς οἴκους ναυτίλων σωθεὶς τάλας>...
σῦφαρ θανεῖται.

874. κρόκαι δὲ Μινυῶν εὐλιπῆ στελγίσματα
τηροῦσιν, ἅλμης οὐδὲ φοιβάζει κλύδων,
οὐδ' ὀμβρία σμήχουσα δηναιὸν νιφάς.

Let the scholiast explain, for verily there is need of an interpreter. ἔστι δὲ τόπος ἐν Σικελίᾳ, ἔνθα γυμνασάμενοι οἱ Ἀργοναῦται τὸν ἱδρῶτα αὐτῶν ὕστερον ἐν τῇ ἄμμῳ ἀπεστελγίσαντο, ὅθεν καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν δίκην ἐλαίου ἐν ταῖς ψήφοις φέρονται ῥανίδες, ἃς οὐδὲ ὁ κλύδων τῆς θαλάσσης οὐδὲ ὄμβρος δύναται καθᾶραι. Had the author of this note νιφάς before him? No, he had something corresponding to ῥανίδες, and that something was probably λίβος. A copyist, not knowing that ὀμβρία was a noun or what λίβος meant, changed it to νιφάς, leaving δηναιὸν construable (cp. 1139) but very unnatural.

869. Ἅρπης Κρόνου πήδημα.

Rather ἅρπης, for he means the sickle ἐν ᾗ Ζεὺς τὰ αἰδοῖα ἔτεμε τοῦ Κρόνου, as the scholiast, reading ἅρπης, explains. The ἅρπης πήδημα then is Zancle, but what is the leap of a sickle? Perhaps ἅρπης Κρόνου πόλισμα, which at least is sense.

877. ἄλλους δὲ θῖνες οἵ τε Ταυχείρων πέλας
μύρμηκες αἰάξουσιν ἐκβεβρασμένους
ἔρημον εἰς Ἄτλαντος οἰκητήριον
θρυλιγμάτων δέρτροισι προσσεσηρότας.

In 878 the MSS vary between αἰάξουσιν, αἰάζουσιν, αἰάσουσιν, of which the first alone is possible. But why should the rocks lament for the people they kill? Read αἱμάξουσιν, a favourite word with Lycophron. προσσεσηρότας is explained by the scholiast as διεσχισμένους, and that it ought to mean if it means anything. Bachmann defends it by quoting σεσηρότα δούρατα νηῶν from Nonnus; the "gaping timbers of a ship" is an intelligible phrase, but does not help προσσεσηρότας; how could sailors or corpses be said to "gape or grin at jagged rocks"? what is the force of πρός? It would be the rocks that would grin; read προσσεσηρότες. "The beaches and reefs shall mangle others, snarling at them with beaks (the metaphor is a little mixed certainly) of broken rocks." So says Mr Swinburne in the *Garden of Cymodoce*:

"Scarce showing the fanged edge of one hungering lip
Or one tooth lipless of the ravening reef."

1419. τὸν χρησμολέσχην αἰτιάσονται βλάβης.

The scholiast observes: ἐν τῷ τρίποδι χάος ἦν μέγα, ὅθεν τὰ μαντεύματα ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Ἅιδου ἀνήρχοντο. Had not the author of this τὸν χασμολέσχην before him?

1435. πολλοὶ δ' ἀγῶνες καὶ φόνοι μεταίχμιοι
λύσουσιν ἀνδρῶν οἱ μὲν ἐν γαίᾳ πάλας (v.l. πέλας)
δειναῖσιν ἀρχαῖς ἀμφιδηριωμένων,
οἱ δ' ἐν μεταφρένοισι βουστρόφοις χθονός.

This passage is quite hopeless in its present form. But the scholiast gives a hint which will help us towards its reconstruction. He explains *δειναῖσιν ἀρχαῖς* as *ταῖς δειναῖς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τοῦ ὕδατος*. This jumble of words must immediately suggest *δίναισιν* for *δειναῖσιν*, and this I find to be actually the reading of some MSS from Bachmann, and, when that is once got, it is evident that *ἀρχαῖς* must be changed to *ἀρχῆς*, for we want a genitive and the singular. When once *δίναισιν* had become *δειναῖσιν*, *ἀρχῆς* was bound to become *ἀρχαῖς*. In 1436 it has long been seen that there are two corruptions. Scheer reads *σχίσουσιν* for *λύσουσιν*, a suggestion technically very brilliant, but I confess that I do not understand how to construe it. And for *γαίᾳ* he would have *ναυσίν*, which certainly gives the required sense. But *πάλας* appears to me as obviously wrong as *γαίᾳ*, and look at the scholiast again: *πάλας, παλαίστρας. γράφεται δὲ καὶ πόλας, τοὺς φυγάδας· γράφεται καὶ πέλας γαίης*. I cannot feel any approach to certainty about the original; possibly the first word was *βλύσουσιν*, which will go very well with *φόνοι*; as to *γαίᾳ πάλας*, does it not conceal one of Lycophron's favourite proper names? The first part suggests *γαιηόχου*, the second *Παλαίμονος*, which may very possibly be right. Compare 1085: *ἐν Λαμητίαις/δίναισιν*.

The whole then will run:

> *πολλοὶ δ' ἀγῶνες καὶ φόνοι μεταίχμιοι*
> *βλύσουσιν (?) ἀνδρῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐν Παλαίμονος (?)*
> *δίναισιν, ἀρχῆς ἀμφιδηριωμένων.*

Lithica.

38. *καὶ πόντοιο κυκωμένου οὐκ ἀλεγίζων*
βήσετ' ἐπὶ τραφερὴν ἀκυμάντοισι πόδεσσι.

The discussions of the commentators over this passage are amusing. Dorville began by inserting *χθόν'* after *τραφερὴν*, making the poet promise that we shall walk "colle piant' asciutte" like Dante's angel—over the dry land! Such at least is the only meaning legitimately to be extracted from the

words, and Tyrwhitt accordingly proceeded to make very merry over this insertion. Ruhnken then retorts that Tyrwhitt mistakes, that Dorville means "get safe to dry land," as if that made any sense, even supposing it to be a possible translation. Whatever Dorville meant, Tyrwhitt meanwhile substitutes ἄλ' for χθόν' and represents a man as walking on the dry sea! Hermann then solemnly balances earth and sea against one another and, without troubling himself about common sense, decides for Tyrwhitt because forsooth ἄλ' would more easily be dropped before ἀκυμάντοισι than χθόν' would. One's astonishment is further increased at learning that Musgrave independently made the same conjecture as Tyrwhitt. Abel in his recent edition of the *Orphica* goes back to Dorville. Why did it not enter into the head of any of these learned critics that ἐπὶ τραφερήν does not require a noun with it at all? "Over the dry" is a familiar Homeric phrase opposed to "over the wet"—ἐπὶ τραφερήν τε καὶ ὑγρήν. True, Homer meant the dry *land*—our poet has used it very loosely of walking dry-shod on the sea; that is his affair, and it is the sort of way in which he uses epic phrases. Probably what he inserted to fill up the verse was simply περ, his usual stop-gap.

61. ἀλλ' οὐ πάγχυ βροτοῖσι σαοφροσύνης ἀλεγίζειν
ἵμερος· αἶψα δὲ πρέσβαν δαημοσύνην ἀτίουσι.

Hermann gives ἀλλὰ σὲ, πρέσβα δαημοσύνη, ἀτίουσι, Abel αἶψα δὲ πρέσβα σ' ἀλιτροσύναις. The change to the vocative is in both unnatural and agrees no better with what follows. Perhaps θεσμὰ δαημοσύνης; if θεσμά by one of the commonest mistakes became θεσβα, the rest follows as a matter of course. θεσβα was patched to πρέσβα and πρέσβα δαημοσύνης to our text.

119. πρίν περ ἀναστήσαντος ἀπὸ χθονὸς αὐχένα δεινὸν
ἐφρασάμην ἤδη τε δέμας μεμαῶτα λαφύξαι.

Read ᾔδη.

134. μάρνασθαι μεμαῶτα ἰδών.

μ' ἰδών? This poet knows nothing of hiatus in third foot.

For the same reason Hermann has corrected *ἐφ' ἅρματι* to *σὺν ἅρματι* in 90.

178. *εἰ γὰρ ἄτερ κρατεροῖο θέλοις.*

κρατεροῦ ἐθέλοις Gerhard, followed by Abel, a most unnecessary change as it introduces a dubious rhythm for this poem, and who can assert that the author preferred the Homeric *ἐθέλω* to *θέλω*? If he did, perhaps we ought to read *κρατεροῖ' ἐθέλοις*, as the Greek critics knew that this was admissible.

188. *αὐτὸν, ὅτις πέλεται φλογὸς αἴτιος, αἴ κε μάλ' ὦκα*
ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάξῃς.

αὐτὸν is nonsense; it can only refer to the *κρύσταλλος* here described, which cannot be meant by the indefinite *ὅ τις*[1]. The crystal is certainly used to kindle the fire and so is *φλογὸς αἴτιος*, but the stick that first catches the fire from the crystal is equally "cause of fire," as the fire requires *both*, or it will not be produced at all. Now the stick *would* be indefinite, being one of many. Read then *ὄζον ὅ τις*, comparing 140, *ὑπέκπυρον ὄζον*, which Orpheus *ἥρπαξεν* from a dead fire on an altar.

275. *ὁππότε δὴ πῦρ*
νηδὺν ἀμφιέσῃσιν ἐνιπλείοιο λέβητος.

Can *ἀμφιέσῃσιν* be possible? Read *ἀμφιέπῃσιν*, for the phrase is copied from the Homeric *γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε*. I rather suspect *νηδὺν* also of being a gloss on *γάστρην*.

392. *σεῖο δ' ἔχεν πολὺ μεῖζον ἀκοιμήτοιο νόοιο*
δεῖμα Φιλοκτήτης, μεμνημένος αἰὲν ἐχίδνης.

Read *νόσοιο*.

397. *πῶς κεν πολιὸν γένος ἐκπροφύγῃσι.*

πολιὸν γένος means serpents. Gesner sees the absurdity of *πολιόν* and tries to palliate it by saying "*πολιός* etiam ferri color" (*Lithica* 308). Must we not substitute *δόλιον*?

[1] Compare however Apollonius Rhodius i. 347.

451. τὸν μὲν ἔτ᾽ ὦ ὀλοΐστερος οὐ λάθεν, οὕνεκ᾽ ἔμελλεν
αὖθι λελείψεσθαι.

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ᾽ ὀλοὴ νόσος ἔλλαβεν Abel, partly after Hermann. But this gives no sense with οὕνεκ᾽ ἔμελλεν κ.τ.λ. It would be nearer the MS, and would give what is wanted, to read: τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ᾽ ὀλοὸς μόρος οὐ λάθεν, "he perceived his dire fate, that he was to be left there." Hermann also, I find, suggests μόρος.

632. ῥῆξε λίνον Κλωθώ· τὸ δέ κ᾽ ἔρχεται ὕστατον ἦμαρ.

This passage is of a charming naïveté; the remedy will infallibly cure a man, but if he die all the same, why then you must reflect that the Fates have cut his thread. However, what is κε doing? It is neither sense nor grammar. Nor would our poet elide καί. Again the uncompounded ἔρχεται is too weak; read then τὸ δ᾽ ἐπέρχεται.

ARTHUR PLATT.

PLATO'S LATER THEORY OF IDEAS.

A criticism on Dr Jackson's articles *Journ. Phil.* x, xi, xiii xiv, xv.

The theory developed by Dr Jackson in this journal is so interesting, so novel, and so perplexing, that many students of Plato must have felt, like myself, an increasing desire to be in a position finally to accept or reject it. Having lately had leisure to devote to this subject I have made an effort to define my own view; and the result is the following paper, which I have offered for publication in the hope that it may evoke some further discussion and elucidation. If I venture to put myself in opposition to Dr Jackson's authority, my apology, I trust, may be found in the relevancy, if not the conclusiveness, of my argument. I propose in dealing with this "later theory of ideas" 1st to criticise it as it stands, 2nd to consider the evidence from which it is elicited, 3rd to examine its consistency with Plato's direct statement of his own theory of knowledge.

I. The theory, in its final form, is briefly as follows:— A "particular" (the object of human apprehension) is an "idea" as it appears when viewed by an individual mind; the corresponding "idea" (if it could be apprehended at all) would be the same entity, viewed by the universal mind. But the "idea" as a matter of fact can never be apprehended, because it is the nature of the universal mind to "pluralise," first its object (*ταὐτόν*[1]), whereby the "ideas" become many instead of one, secondly itself, whereby individual minds are produced. Thus the only actual mode of cognition

[1] *Journ. Phil.* xiii. 25.

is that of "particulars" by individual minds. Such cognition is an intuitive perception of "things"; but on the top of this perception comes the process of 'knowledge,' the object of which is to attain clear definitions of "natural kinds" or species, the true correlatives of the "ideas."

On this theory, as it stands, the following criticisms may be offered.

(1) It is undeduced. For though it may be true that it is the nature of the ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου (a synonym for the universal mind) to part with its unity and universality, yet this is not immediately obvious as an axiom; it cannot be fairly taken as the starting point of a philosophy. Yet it is as an axiom that it is presented to us, for there is (so far as I am aware) no hint even at a deduction (or, for that matter, a statement) of it, in any of the extant dialogues. Yet on this axiom depends the whole theory as to the incognisability of the "idea" and as to its relation to the "particular."

(2) The theory of ideas, so conceived, is no longer a theory of knowledge. By it, knowledge is supposed to consist in the defining of species[1]; but the theory of ideas, though it carries with it as a corollary the existence of species, does not determine or justify any method of defining them. The principles of classification (as e.g. whether plants should be grouped according to the number of their petals or the character of their sexual organs) must be sought elsewhere; and however they are determined they will be determined without any reference to the theory of ideas.

Supposing, however, that species were approximately knowable (a supposition not justified by the theory of ideas), in what form could such knowledge finally present itself? The species it would appear, like the hypothetical "idea[2]," would be cognised as a given element standing in certain definite relations to other given elements, those relations being expressed by the categories οὐσία, ἑτερότης, ταὐτότης. On this conception two comments suggest themselves:—(*a*) there is always, in each idea, and therefore in each species, an irreducible given

[1] *Journ. Phil.* xi. 324. [2] *Journ. Phil.* xv. 288.

element, whereby the *αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτὸ εἶδος* is something apart from all its relations (*b*) the whole series of ideas (and therefore of correspondent species) is given, not deduced. For though it is postulated that they are derived from *τὸ ἀγαθόν* (identified with *ταὐτόν Journ. Phil.* XIII. 25) yet that derivation is not regarded as an inevitable logical process. It is merely stated that *ταὐτόν*, in order to produce existence in time and space, must pluralise itself; it is not supposed to be proved, or provable, that it must pluralise itself into such and such definite ideas proceeding inevitably from its own notion. So that even if species be approximately knowable, they are knowable only as given entities which are asserted, for reasons external to their own definitions, to be the product of *τὸ ἀγαθόν*.

II. Though however the theory is open to these criticisms it does not follow that it was not held by Plato. I proceed therefore to examine the evidence upon which Dr Jackson attributes it to him. As it is necessary for me to be brief, and the articles on which I have to comment are singularly full and precise, I cannot hope to avoid that amount of misrepresentation which a summary is bound to involve. I propose to notice only those points which I conceive to be the foundation of the argument, leaving it to my readers (who are presumably acquainted with the articles) to be on their guard against any possible, though unintentional, falsification.

The points which Dr Jackson seeks to establish are briefly these:

(1) That the relation of particular to idea expressed by the term *μέθεξις* is inconsistent with and was superseded by the relation expressed by the term *μίμησις*.

(2) That the statement that there are "ideas" corresponding to e.g. *μέγα*, *ὅμοιον*, *ἄδικον*, *θερμόν*, *τράπεζα* was superseded by the statement that there are only ideas corresponding to "natural kinds" e.g. *βοῦς*.

(3) That the statement that "ideas" are the only object of true knowledge was superseded by the statement that ideas are unknowable; this statement depending on the hypothesis of the relation of universal to individual minds which we have re-

ferred to above. The earlier theory is contained in the *Phaedo* and *Republic*; the later is supposed to be developed in the *Philebus, Parmenides, Timaeus, Theaetetus, Sophist* and *Politicus*. I propose to follow Dr Jackson through these dialogues.

A. *Philebus.* The starting point of the new view is the passage of this dialogue (22 C—27 B) where Plato defines the following elements, (1) *τὸ ἄπειρον*, (2) *τὸ πέρας ἔχον*, (3) the product of the union of (1) and (2), (4) the cause of that union; Dr Jackson holds that (3) includes both "idea" and "particular," the former being the union of the appropriate *ποσόν* (*τὸ μέτριον*) with a given *ἄπειρον*[1], the latter, the union of some other *ποσόν*, more or less approximating to the "appropriate," with the same *ἄπειρον*. But of this distinction between the appropriate and the non-appropriate *ποσόν* there is no hint in the passage in question save the juxtaposition of the two words *μέτριον* and *ποσόν*:—*μὴ ἀφανίσαντε τὸ ποσόν, ἀλλ' ἐάσαντε αὐτό τε καὶ τὸ μέτριον ἐν τῇ τοῦ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον καὶ σφόδρα καὶ ἠρέμα ἕδρᾳ ἐγγενέσθαι.* Now, supposing Plato to have formulated already the theory which Dr Jackson desiderates, it would be possible to contrast and interpret *τὸ μέτριον* and *τὸ ποσόν* in the way which he indicates; but it is not possible to establish the theory on the slender basis of the juxtaposition of the two terms. And the statements, based on this passage, that (*a*) Plato's conception of the relation of "idea" to "particular" has "undergone a complete transformation[2]," (*b*) *κακόν, θερμόν*, &c. (i.e. "all general names which connote divergence from types") "will cease to have equivalent ideas," can scarcely be even plausibly maintained.

B. *Parmenides.* (1) The contention, based originally upon the *Philebus*, that Plato has abandoned the theory of *μέθεξις* is held to be supported by this dialogue. The evidence to that effect depends on two assumptions, (*a*) that the criticisms of Parmenides on the theory in question are conclusive, and endorsed by Plato himself, (*b*) that the suggestion made by Socrates at 132 C, so far from being set aside by the objection

[1] *Journ. Phil.* x. 275. [2] *Journ. Phil.* x. 283.

raised by Parmenides, is in fact a statement of Plato's own revised theory.

Now (*a*) the criticisms of Parmenides on the theory of *μέθεξις* are only valid against a materialistic interpretation of it; on the supposition, that is, that Plato originally conceived the "idea" as both materially present in all the particulars and materially isolated from them. But it appears far less probable that this was Plato's conception than that it was one elicited by stupid interpreters from his necessarily ambiguous language, and here adopted by Parmenides; in this case it is not the theory of *μέθεξις* but a misinterpretation of it that is refuted in the passage in question; a supposition which appears the more probable when it is remembered that the latter part of the dialogue is full of sophistical arguments based upon this and similar misconceptions of logical relations[1]. Thus, for example, Parmenides' objection to the theory of *μέθεξις* has just as much, and as little, cogency, as his argument about *σμικρότης* and *μέγεθος* at 149 E seq.: and the weight which we imagine Plato to attach to it will depend on our conception of the purpose of the whole dialogue.

(*b*) If, however, the criticism of Parmenides is to be regarded as destructive to the theory of *μέθεξις* it is at least equally destructive to the theory of *μίμησις*. The latter, it is true, is re-stated by Plato in the *Timaeus*; but so far as the *Parmenides* is concerned the one theory is as much, or as little, disposed of as the other; there is no hint that Plato himself rejects the former and adopts the latter.

But Dr Jackson finds further evidence of the change of view in the latter part of the dialogue. It is not satisfactory to quarrel with his ingenious interpretation of this difficult argument without suggesting an alternative view; but I am not at present writing a paper on the *Parmenides* and must content myself with recording objections.

(*a*) Dr Jackson identifies the *ἕν* and *πολλά* of hypotheses (1) and (4) with the "idea" and the "particulars," respectively, as conceived in the earlier theory. But the *ἕν* of hyp. (1)

[1] See a pamphlet on the *Parmenides* by Dr Karl Goebel, 1880.

is absolute unity; whereas the "idea," besides being *one*, was also supposed to participate in the *many*; similarly, the πολλά of hyp. (4) are absolute plurality; whereas the particulars, besides being *many*, were also supposed to participate in the *one*. When, therefore, Plato shows, in the argument in question, that *one* is inconceivable unless it is also *many*, and *many* inconceivable unless they are also *one*, if he is dealing with the theory of ideas at all, he is rather establishing than refuting the position assumed in the "earlier" theory.

(*b*) Hypotheses (2) and (3) are supposed to represent the later theory[1]. Inasmuch however as nothing is said to define the exact relation of the ἕν to the πολλά, the relation of μέθεξις is *a priori* just as applicable as that of μίμησις. It is apparently on the terms πέρας παρέχον and ἄπειρον that Dr Jackson relies when he supposes the latter relation to be intended, finding in them a reference to the *Philebus* and to the theory thence elicited. But, as we have seen, it is at least doubtful whether this theory *can* be thence elicited; and there is therefore no reason for interpreting by it the hypotheses in question.

In the article on the *Timaeus*[2] we find the statement that in the *Parmenides* Plato 'propounded a new theory of the relation of the "idea" to its "particulars. The "idea" he conceived stands to its "particulars" in the relation of model to copies.' This definite statement, we have seen, cannot be justified by the language of the *Parmenides* itself; it derives plausibility only from its agreement with (*a*) the conjectural interpretation of the *Philebus*, (*b*) the direct statement of the *Timaeus*. From the latter (and from the latter only) we know with certainty that Plato did conceive the "idea" as a παράδειγμα to the "particular"; but we have no evidence that he rejected the theory of μέθεξις. It is quite possible that both terms denote the same relation, viewed from two several points of view.

(2) In the *Parmenides*, it is further maintained, Plato abandoned ideas of "relations" (i.e. "greatness," "likeness," &c.); this statement is supported by two arguments.

[1] *Journ. Phil.* XI. 320. [2] *Journ. Phil.* XIII. 3.

(*a*) That the paradox which such ideas were invented to explain has ceased to be paradoxical[1]. Plato, having perceived that e.g. "great" and "small" are relative terms, no longer needs the hypothesis of correspondent "ideas" to explain the fact that e.g. Socrates is both tall and short. But the statement which gives apparent cogency to this argument, that the ideas in question were invented to explain the paradox of predication, would seem to require substantiation. To Plato (as is specially noticed *Rep.* 523, 4) the philosophical importance of such concepts as "great" and "small" lies in the fact that by employing them as predicates the mind is disturbed in its crude materialistic interpretation of phenomena and forced to recognise in its object an intellectual element; to turn e.g. from Socrates and Simmias to what we should now call the category of quantity, and what Plato called the "ideas" "great" and "small." Now the recognition that the terms in question are "relative" does not destroy this position; rather it is implied in it; and therefore the assumption that their relativity was recognised by Plato in the *Parmenides*, but ignored in the *Phaedo*, does not involve the consequence that in the former dialogue he abandoned the ideas under discussion.

(*b*) The second argument in this contention is that ideas are described as *αὐτὰ καθ' αὑτά*, and that this phrase is inapplicable to such "universal predicates" as "like" "unlike," &c.[2] Here the force of the argument depends on the interpretation of the phrase *αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτό*, which is, apparently, assumed to denote an existence which is independent of all other existences; in this sense it could not be applied to the category "like." But the phrase in question was apparently invented merely to mark an opposition to the changing impressions of sense; a given "thing" becomes now "like" now "unlike"; but the "idea" "like" never becomes (i.e. loses its own nature and changes into) the idea "unlike"; in contrast, therefore, to the "like" thing it has an independent substantial existence, i.e. it is *αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτό*. The mere fact, therefore, that like, unlike, &c. are recognised as "universal predicates" does not involve their deposition from the class of *αὐτὰ καθ' αὑτά* ideas. I am therefore unable to

[1] *Journ. Phil.* XI. 321. [2] *Journ. Phil.* XI. 322.

assent to the statement (*Journ. Phil.* XIII. 2) that we have in the *Parmenides* a distinct denial of *αὐτὰ καθ' αὑτὰ εἴδη* in the case of relations. The supposed extension of the denial to "negations, and artificial products" I will not pause to examine; it is sufficient for my purpose if I have shown that the restriction of "ideas" to those correspondent to "natural kinds" (these being regarded as different in kind from "universal predicates") is, so far, not proven.

C. *Timaeus.* The peculiarity of Dr Jackson's view of this dialogue is that it postulates certain propositions which, so far from being formulated, are not (as far as I am aware) even hinted at in this or any other dialogue[1]. These propositions may be summarised thus:—

1. Universal mind, in order to become "actual," must "pluralise" itself as subject into individual minds, and itself as object into a series (or rather a number) of "ideas."

2. The ideas, therefore, themselves are incognisable.

3. But they are perceived imperfectly, as phenomena, by the individual minds.

4. These individual minds attribute to them an external existence as "things," misled by the fact that the same phenomenon is simultaneously perceived by several minds.

From these propositions[2] issues the theory that whereas a sensation is an eternal mode or potentiality of thought cognised under the limitations of space and time, the idea is the same mode or potentiality of thought cognised, if that were possible, without those limitations.

It is thus that the conception of the idea as a *παράδειγμα* is explained, and the *Timaeus* regarded as developing and justifying the view already elicited from the *Philebus* and *Parmenides.*

There is nothing, however, in the language of the *Timaeus* to justify the attribution of these propositions to Plato, except the fact that its semi-mythical and general terminology does not definitely exclude them. The interpretation is not evolved from but imposed upon the dialogue; and the fact that it is

[1] *Journ. Phil.* XIII. 21 seq. [2] *Journ. Phil.* XIII. 24.

in harmony with the interpretation previously offered of the *Philebus* and *Parmenides* does not argue strongly in its favour, because, as we have seen, *they* require *its* support, as much as *it* does *theirs*. The whole result, therefore, that has been elicited from the three dialogues is not an inevitable, nor even a probable, but at most a possible theory. This theory is already evolved in its completeness in the three articles already examined; and I shall therefore permit myself to pass very lightly over the additional evidence contained in the three that yet remain.

D. *Theaetetus.* (1) The first point to be noticed here is the statement (XIII. 269) that the theory of sensation given at 155 D—157 B is inconsistent with the doctrine of the immanent idea formulated in the *Phaedo* and *Republic*. In the former dialogue e.g. θερμότης is treated as an "idea" (105 C). Dr Jackson shows that this view has been abandoned in the *Theaetetus*, where heat is regarded as an interaction between a potentiality of acting and a potentiality of being acted upon. As a matter of fact I see no reason to believe that Plato, when speaking precisely, and from a primarily ontological standpoint, would have postulated an idea of "heat" in the *Phaedo* (see Part III of this Paper); but I cannot pause at present to give reasons for this view, and therefore freely admit that if Plato did, in that dialogue, regard sensations as substantial being (i.e. as ideas) that view is inconsistent with the passage in the *Theaetetus*. So far, then, as regards ideas correspondent to sensations, I am content for the present to accept Dr Jackson's hypothesis of a change of view.

(2) The two statements that "being is a potentiality of acting and being acted upon" and that the true being (τὸ παντελῶς ὄν) is νοῦς, are taken as confirmatory of the particular theory of ideas elicited from the *Timaeus*[1]. But they are equally confirmatory of *any* theory which treats "ideas" as thoughts.

(3) The theory of sensation given in the *Theaetetus* is taken to represent the view of the "particular" elicited from the *Timaeus*[2]. This identification is only possible on the hypo-

[1] *Journ. Phil.* XIV. 204.

[2] *Journ. Phil.* XIV. 205.

thesis that in that theory "mind being the subject thought is the object"—a hypothesis which is not borne out by any statement in the passage in question.

E. *Sophist.* Dr Jackson identifies the εἰδῶν φίλοι of 248 seq. with Plato himself in the earlier stage of his philosophy[1], and supposes him to reject this earlier conception of the ideas, because it denied relations between them. There appears however, as has been already remarked, to be no sufficient reason to conclude from such phrases as αὐτὸ καθ' αὑτό, μονοειδές &c., (used to mark a contrast with the changing "particulars" of sense) that such relations were excluded in this earlier theory.

F. *Politicus.* The only important bearing of this dialogue on the new theory of ideas is that διαίρεσις is regarded as the method whereby the species, postulated as the true correspondents to ideas, are to be approximately defined. This view of the application of διαίρεσις presupposes, but does not confirm, the theory; a different view of the ideas would suggest a different interpretation of διαίρεσις.

G. Lastly, Dr Jackson relies on a passage of the metaphysics of Aristotle to confirm his theory[2]. The whole question of Aristotle's criticism of Plato is so difficult, and requires so special and thorough an examination that I may be pardoned for not entering upon it here. But as Dr Jackson himself remarks[3] "it is possible that Aristotle has seriously misunderstood and misrepresented his master"; and though his authority would be confirmatory to a theory already established on the evidence of Plato's own dialogues it cannot be accepted as a substitute for such evidence. If therefore Dr Jackson's view cannot be supported by the testimony of Plato himself, a critic is justified in passing over the alleged testimony of Aristotle in its favour.

As a result of this examination of Dr Jackson's articles, I am justified, I think, in concluding that his interpretation of Plato is not even probable; I am certainly justified in concluding that it is not proved: and this conclusion, I believe, will hold, after allowance has been made for such unintentional mis-

[1] *Journ. Phil.* XIV. 202.
[2] *Journ. Phil.* XI. 285.
[3] *Journ. Phil.* XI. 258.

representation as the brevity I have studied perhaps inevitably involves. I should not however have joined issue with Dr Jackson if I did not believe that his view is not merely not proved, but is positively opposed to Plato's direct teaching about knowledge. This point it remains for me to endeavour to establish.

III. The most direct and definite exposition of Plato's theory of knowledge is to be found at the close of the sixth book of the *Republic*. He there distinguishes two rational processes;

(1) *διάνοια*, which involves hypotheses, i.e. a "given," or non-rational, element, and is therefore impure; as an example the science of mathematics is adduced, where the given element is the special figure or the special number under consideration; but plainly all sciences (with the exception of "dialectic" as defined below) will fall into this class, since they all involve some element that is assumed for the purpose of the argument, as for example the notion of "justice" in moral, or of "ether" in physical inquiries.

(2) *νόησις*, called also dialectic (511 c), which is pure, i.e. involves no hypotheses: it is this method alone that leads to *ἐπιστήμη*, true knowledge. Its objects are *τὰ ὄντα*, or "ideas"; and these objects are not to be *given*, they are to be implicit in the nature of mind. Such objects we have in the "categories" which modern philosophy defines as prior to, and conditions of, all experience; that is to say, in just those "universal predicates" which Dr Jackson supposes Plato to reject from the class of ideas. We have no experience of any other objects which answer to the requirements of the passage; and we are bound, therefore, either to identify "ideas" with "categories," or to leave the passage inexplicable. If we adopt the former course we have in the *Sophist* and in parts of the *Parmenides* and so far as I am aware only here in Plato) examples of pure dialectic, that is of the examination of the nature and relations of *ἕν*, *πολλά*, *οὐσία*, *ἑτερότης*, *ταυτότης*, *κίνησις*, *στάσις*. These examples however are still only fragmentary; Plato's complete ideal, in the passage of the *Republic* under consideration, was to deduce the "ideas" from a single self-explaining *ἀρχή*: this

may be presumably identified with τὸ ἀγαθόν of *Republic* 508 seq.; and the resulting definition of knowledge may be thus expressed—"knowledge is the deduction from the idea of the good of the whole series of ideas (i.e. categories) which form the rational element in all experience." On this identification of ideas with "categories" I do not desire, at present, to insist; it will serve, however, to make clear the kind of knowledge which Plato conceives would be satisfactory. Nor do I find any evidence that he has modified his conception in what, according to Dr Jackson's theory, are the later dialogues. In the *Philebus* for example (56 C seq.), the same distinction is drawn between mathematics (whose method as we saw is διάνοια) and Dialectic; and in the *Sophist* (253 C) Dialectic is defined, quite in the spirit of the *Republic*, as the process which defines the relations of γένη (the word is used in this dialogue interchangeably with εἴδη); and the γένη selected for examination are *categories*.

If, however, an "idea" is that which is cognised in the same way as a category (i.e. intuitively, as belonging to the nature of mind), how are we to account for the application of the word εἶδος, or its equivalents, to such concepts as "heat," "table," &c.[1]? The confusion is natural enough in a writer like Plato who has to invent his nomenclature, and is more concerned at any given moment to make clear the particular point at issue than to reduce to consistency his various independent utterances. It is plain that in the *Phaedo* and *Republic* he applies the word εἶδος, or its equivalents, to any general notion; but it does not follow that he did not recognise the distinction between a concept like "table," involving a given element of sense, and a pure category like οὐσία; it only follows that in the particular passages in question he is intent on emphasising not that distinction, but the more general one between particular and universal. That as a matter of fact he had grasped the former distinction is evident not only from his exposition of the theory of knowledge in the *Republic*, but from *Theaetetus* 184 B seq., where οὐσία, ὁμοιότης, &c. are clearly differentiated from θερμόν,

[1] See *Journ. Phil.* x. 254.

σκληρόν, &c. I see then no reason to doubt that the passage in the *Republic* contains not only the completest, but the final statement of Plato's ideal of knowledge: but if this be so it is impossible that he should have held the theory attributed to him by Dr Jackson; for, as was noticed at the outset,

(1) That theory is based itself upon unproved hypotheses, and therefore is an example of διάνοια, and cannot be "known" to be true.

(2) The objects of knowledge according to that theory (*a*) are not purely intellectual (i.e. contain a "given" element), (*b*) are not rationally deduced.

It appears to me then that the theory in question is not only not proved but is directly opposed to Plato's own teaching: and that for the latter reason, if not for the former, it is impossible to adopt it.

G. LOWES DICKINSON.

THE BODLEIAN MS. OF EUSEBIUS'S CHRONICLE.

My attention has been called to some remarks relating to myself in Vol. XVIII. p. 277. Mr E. G. Hardy, speaking of the Bodleian 6th century MS. of Jerome's translation of Eusebius's Chronicle, there writes as follows :—

"A few months later than this Dr Mommsen was in Oxford, and the Librarian thought that at last the hour was come and the man to whom this important discovery might be revealed. And so in this somewhat circuitous way it has been permitted to the Professor and Reader of Latin and to Oxford scholars generally to become aware of the existence of this MS. in their own Library."

When I first saw the MS., I called the attention of Mr Madan and Mr Macray to it, and took the earliest opportunity of showing it to Prof. Westwood and, I believe, Prof. Sanday. I showed it to Dr Mommsen at a later time simply because I knew he was at work on MSS. of early chronicles, and I should have shown it to any one of whom I had known the same. But for months before that time it had been lying open in the palaeography-case, 'plain for all folk to see,' the first volume in the case, with a label on it written by myself stating its contents and ascribing it to the early 6th century.

E. W. B. NICHOLSON.

ON PLAUTINE METRE.

Its regard for the Accent as well as the Quantity of words.

In the fifteenth chapter of his Prolegomena on the text and metre of Plautus, the chapter entitled 'de Accentu Grammatico,' Ritschl lays down his famous thesis that in Plautus and the older Dramatists, though the metre was quantitative and not accentual metre, some regard was taken of the accent which the words bore in ordinary speech: cum quantitatis severitate summa accentus observationem, quoad ejus fieri posset, conciliatam esse. He is careful to guard against the danger of pushing this theory to an extreme. Were the accent rigorously followed, an Iambic Senarius would be impossible in Latin, for it requires at least in the last foot of the line that the metrical ictus shall fall on the last syllable of the word; while the Latin accent, as Grammarians like Priscian tell us again and again, fell normally only on the penult, or on the antepenultimate syllable. It would then be impossible to argue that Plautus regulated his verse as much by accent as by quantity. But it is, he shews, equally wrong to suppose that Plautus took no regard whatever of the natural accent of the words in constructing his lines. We can detect an attempt to reconcile the accent with the metrical ictus, wherever the reconciliation is possible; and a great many lines in which the accent and ictus appeared in the received text at variance with each other have, he observes, in the Ambrosian Palimpsest a different arrangement, which removes this variance. In the following chapter, 'de Accentu Logico,' Ritschl extends his theory in another direction. The emphatic words, he shews, occupy as a rule the Arses, the un-

important words the Theses of a line. He quotes the opening verses of the Trinummus in illustration:

sequere hác *me* gnáta *ut* múnus fúngarís tuúm.
Sequór, *sed* fínem fóre quem dícam nésció:

and from the prologue,

rogat
ut líceat póssidére *hanc* nómen fábulám,

and bids us notice how carefully the unimportant words of the sentence (which I have indicated by italics), are relegated to the Theses. In the last line *ut, hanc* might be omitted without injury to the sense: *rogat liceat possidere nomen fabulam;* and these words, which in actual discourse would not have prominence given to them, but would remain unaccented, are found in Plautus' verse to lack also the metrical ictus. But on this point too Ritschl is careful not to push the theory to an extreme. The rule is not observed by Plautus with monotonous regularity. There is just so much disregard of it as to produce what Ritschl happily calls in another of his writings the 'harmonische Disharmonie' of Plautine verse. Thus when two words are contrasted with each other, they have both as a rule the metrical ictus, as they would in everyday speech have a marked accentuation, e.g. *Dávus sum, non Oédipus,* Ter. Andr. 194, and the absence of this feature often indicates a corruption in a line. Still this rule is not slavishly followed. It is sometimes disregarded intentionally: e.g. Trin. 59,

vin cónmutémus? túam ego dúcam et tú meám?

where in speaking one would naturally accentuate the first syllable of all four words, *túam, égo, tú, méam,* but where the adaptation of the metrical ictus to each of these would have a monotonous effect. Sometimes it is departed from through metrical necessity, e.g. Trin. 65,

edepól proinde út diu vívitúr, bene vívitúr,

'the *longer* we live, the *easier* we live', where the prosodical nature of the words *diu* and *bene* made it difficult to bring them into the Arses of the line.

The truth of the remarks contained in this sixteenth chapter of the Prolegomena can hardly be questioned. We cannot read a page of Plautus without noticing how naturally the important words appear in the Arses of the line, while the 'Sentence-enclitics', the words in fact which we omit in writing telegrams, slip into the Theses; and this theory has remained since Ritschl's time a cardinal point for emendators of the text of Plautus. Its acceptance involves the recognition of the fact that the Early Latin imitation of the Greek Dramatic Metre, though, like its Greek original, it was essentially quantitative, had a certain regard for the accents of words, which was entirely unknown in Greek Poetry. Now the researches of recent years into the metres of the different Indo-European peoples have shewn the isolated position of Greek Poetry in this respect, the metres of other nations depending as a rule either on Accent or on the number of syllables in a line, or on both, and have made it at least probable that the native Latin Poetry, the Saturnian Verse, was likewise accentual poetry, and not in any great degree quantitative. The natural inference therefore is that the early imitators of the Greek Metres were still so far under the influence of the native poetry, that they could not prevent the accentual element from asserting itself to a greater or less extent in these first attempts at writing quantitative verse, a species of verse which was alien to the genius of their language, and that it took years of diligent cultivation of Greek models, before this native growth was entirely eradicated from Latin Poetry. Side by side with the quantitative verse of literary Rome would be always existing in Vulgar Latin the accentual poetry, such as we see in the rude songs of soldiers at triumphs, e.g.

écce Caésar núnc triúmphat quí subégit Gállias
(Suet. Caes. chap. 80)

with coincidence of accent and ictus, until at last, with the advent of Christianity, the 'poor man's poetry' became the poetry of the Church and the nation. (Compare the remarks of St Augustine on his 'Psalmus contra partem Donati': volens

etiam causam Donatistarum ad ipsius humillimi vulgi et omnium imperitorum atque idiotarum notitiam venire, et eorum, quantum fieri posset per nos, inhaerere memoriae, Psalmum qui eis cantaretur...feci: Retract. I. 20.)

This account of the development of Latin Poetry has been recently impugned by Prof. W. Meyer, a scholar who has devoted a great deal of attention to the later Latin versification. He is inclined to assign the intrusion of the accentual element into post-classical verse to a much later date than is generally proposed; in fact, he will not allow any poem earlier than this Psalm (c. 393 A.D.) of St Augustine to be called accentual verse. He is in consequence suspicious of the theory that ante-classical poetry paid regard to accent, and has written a long article in the Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy for 1884, in which he states perhaps as powerful a case as can be stated against the views expressed in the fifteenth chapter of Ritschl's Prolegomena[1]. He calls attention to the large number of words found over and over again with a metrical accent which does not follow the 'paenultima law', but falls on the last syllable, e.g. *volŏ*[2], or even on the fourth syllable from the end, e.g. *bălineae, făcilius, cōnsilium.* But his main contention is that such coincidence as there is of accent and ictus in Plautus is really due to the law of the Latin Accent, which requires every long penultimate syllable to be accented. The metrical ictus falls normally on long syllables in the line, and where these long syllables happen to be penultimate syllables, the ictus must coincide with the accent. There are thus more chances of the ictus and accent lighting on the same syllable in Latin than in Greek Poetry, and this, and this only, is the reason of the coincidences to which Ritschl has drawn attention in Plautus. Then he proceeds to make

[1] He hardly takes account of the sixteenth chapter at all.

[2] The only way of adapting the metrical to the natural accent of these iambic words was to follow the tendency of the pronunciation of the time, and to shorten their final syllable. This is done for example in Terence Eun. prol. 8 *Ex Graecis* bŏnīs *Latīnas fēcit nŏn bonās*, where *bŏnis* and *nŏn bonas* being contrasted, had both to be got into the Arsis. But that this shortening was regarded as a licence, only to be employed in cases of necessity, has been shown by Leppermann in his monograph quoted below.

a minute investigation into the technique of Plautus' versification, especially his treatment of the trochaic and iambic caesura, with the object of shewing that his avoidance of this and that form of caesura would compel the choice at certain parts of the line of such words as would necessarily have the ictus on the same syllable as the accent. These details of technique, which it is not the object of this paper to discuss, have been challenged by Prof. Langen in the Philologus, vol. XLVI, who also supplies us with a striking refutation of Meyer's main argument. He himself, he tells us, once made the experiment of applying the Latin accentual laws to the trimeters of Aristophanes, but found that the coincidence of accent and ictus was not at all so frequent as it is in the Senarii of Plautus and Terence, a fact which plainly indicates some other influence to be at work in the latter. And Prof. Klotz, in his great work on Early Roman Metre (Grundzüge der altrömischen Metrik, 1890), has proved beyond the possibility of doubt the existence of an accentual element in the Dramatic Verse of the Republic. Besides the avoidance of metrical accentuations like *genéra, optíma, consilíum, intellégit*, which can be nothing else than an avoidance of a too violent clashing of the metrical with the natural accentuation, *géneră, óptima, consílium, intéllegit*, there is a peculiar development of the Dipody law in the hands of the Roman Dramatists, which Klotz shews to be intimately connected with a regard for Accent. The Dipody law of the Greek Drama prescribes that in the latter part, the (metrically) important part, of each Dipody of an Iambic line, a Spondee shall not be substituted for an Iambus.

ὅσα δὴ δέδηγ|μαι τὴν ἐμαν|τοῦ καρδίαν,

could not be changed to *ὅσα δὴ λῦπο|ῦμαι, κ.τ.λ.*; for the substitution of a Spondee for an Iambus at the end of a Dipody would spoil the iambic character of the line. The corresponding law of the Latin Drama excludes from this position, not all Spondees, but only spondaic words and word-endings.

vin cómmūtēmus? túam ego du|cam et tú meam?

is legitimate, but

vin cónmūtēm?| vin túam ego, etc.

would be rejected as uniambic. And why? Evidently because the conflict of the natural accent *conmútem* with the metrical ictus *-mutém* was felt to bring into unpleasing prominence the irregular formation of this important part of the line. Change the second word to a word in which there is not this conflict, say *mūtŭēr*, and the line becomes rhythmic again:

vin mútuer?| vin túam ego, etc.

Langen and Klotz have, between them, set the accentual element of Early Latin Dramatic Metre in so clear a light that it is hardly possible now to deny the existence of this element altogether. The only question is of the extent to which it asserts itself. It is the aim of this paper to prove that the part played by Accent in the verses of Plautus and Terence is much greater than has been hitherto thought, and that a very large number of supposed cases of discrepancy between metrical and grammatical accentuation in their plays are really cases of coincidence. And first of all I would lay stress on the fact that we have in these two writers a great many colloquial phrases, phrases which evidently come direct from the streets of Rome into their pages, which shew uniformly the same metrical accentuation, and that too, though there is often no necessity for this from the prosodical nature of the words[1]. The common phrase 'I wish to know', *volo scire*, would from its prosodical nature, its arrangement of short and long syllables, require a metrical accentuation of this kind *voló scire*, and we should expect to find iambic lines beginning *voló scire ígitur, voló scire aútem*, etc. But the metrical accentuation in all the passages where the phrase occurs in Plautus is *volŏ scíre*, except in two where it is *vólo scire* (Kellerhoff in Studemund's Studien auf dem Gebiete des archäischen Lateins, II. p. 83, 1891), and this curious fact gives

[1] They have been brought into notice by Prof. Seyffert especially and also by students of the late Prof. Studemund. A good deal however still requires to be done in this branch of Plautine study.

strong presumption that in ordinary conversation the phrase would be pronounced *volŏ scíre* with the main accent of the phrase on the first syllable of the Infinitive. Similarly the phrase of endearment, *voluptas mea*, is always scanned by Plautus *volŭptás mea*, with a shortening of the second syllable that is only found when the next syllable has the natural accent, e.g. *volŭptátis, volŭptátem, potĕstátem.* A common expression of disappointment or despair is *vaé miserŏ mihi*, with ictus on the last syllable of *misero* and on the Interjection. Now these accentuations must be declared to be contrary to the elementary laws of Latin Accentuation, the 'paenultima laws' as they are called, which would require as the ordinary accent *vólo scîre, volúptas méa, vaé mísero míhi.* And these elementary laws are the only laws appealed to by Meyer in his article, and, I may almost add, by Ritschl in his Prolegomena. The fact that certain words, in certain collocations in a sentence, would have a different accent from that which they would bear if pronounced separately, has hardly ever been considered in the discussion of the relation of ictus and accent in Plautus' lines. And yet it surely stands to reason that Latin, like other languages, would have its enclitic words, its auxiliary verbs, its emphatic and unemphatic pronouns, its subordinate words in certain word-groups, and that in a spoken sentence each and every word would not have meted out to it the full measure of accent which the Grammarians assign to it when pronounced apart. In the phrase *volo scire* the verb *volo* is a mere auxiliary, which resigns its accent in favour of the important word of the phrase, *scire*. In *voluptas mea* the Possessive Pronoun is an enclitic appendage of the Noun, and the compound word *voluptas-mea* is by the ordinary law of Latin Accentuation accented on the antepenultimate, *voluptás-mea*. The Personal Pronoun is treated in the same way as the Possessive in *vaé miserŏ-mihi*. If this be the case in these phrases, it is reasonable to extend the usage to other phrases of the same kind. In Curc. 658:

> *fratér mi, salve. Dĕos volo bene vórtere*
> *istám rem vobis,*

the first word will not properly be regarded as shewing no coincidence of metrical and natural accent. It is metrically scanned as it would be naturally pronounced, *fratér-mi.* In Aul. 690:

egone út te advórsum méntiár, matér meá,

the metrical ictus of the last two words will only be so far at variance with the natural accent, that the ictus falls on the last syllable as well as on the third last of the compound *matér-mea,* whereas in ordinary pronunciation only a secondary accent, at most, could fall there. Similarly the endings of v. 693 *em! matér mea,* v. 694 *fratrém meum,* v. 697, *servúm meum,* and a host of similar endings throughout the plays of Plautus and Terence, are saved from the reproach of bringing the metrical and the natural accent into marked disagreement. The accentuation *volo-scíre* may be used to save from the same charge such endings as *factúm-volo, faciás-volo,* and will at any rate give a presumption in favour of endings like *coctúm-dabo* (= *coquam*), *missúm-face* (= *dimitte*).

All this points to the conclusion that if we had a better knowledge of the laws and usages of Latin Accentuation, and in particular of the accentuation of words in a sentence, we should find the harmony between the ictus and accent in the lines of the Early Dramatists to be much greater than has ever been supposed. But unfortunately this knowledge is difficult to acquire. The Latin Grammarians do indeed give us a good deal of information, but it mainly concerns the accentuation, or proper pronunciation, of words when standing alone, and rarely gives us insight into the enclitic words of a Latin sentence, or the Latin idiosyncrasies of word-grouping. Not a little may be learnt from the forms assumed by Latin words in the Romance languages, but for the most part we are compelled to fall back on the analogy of other languages. Let us see what results we can attain by these means, and what light they throw on the relation of ictus to accent in Plautus.

Among Latin 'Sentence-enclitics' we can hardly be wrong in classing first:

(1) The various parts of the Substantive Verb.

That *sum, es, est, sim, eram,* &c., were in ordinary circumstances enclitic words is probable enough from the analogy of other languages, even if we had no definite proof that such was the case. The Romance languages however do supply us with the needed evidence, for the forms assumed in them by the Latin *es* (Span. es), *erat* (Ital. era, Span. era), *erit* (O. Fr. ert) shew that the *e* in those words was unaccented. An accented *e* would have taken a different form. The Latin *negat,* for example, where the *e* is accented appears in Italian as niega, in Spanish as niega, and had *erat* been an accented word we should have had in Italian iera, in Spanish yera. The mode too in which *es, est* are written in the best MSS of Plautus, e.g. *amatus* (*amatu's*), *amatust, amatast, amatumst* for *amatus es, amatus est, amata est, amatum est,* shews that they were treated as mere appendages of the Past Participle Passive. If we examine the way in which Plautus deals with these and other forms of the Substantive Verb, we find that their metrical handling corresponds wonderfully with what we should suppose their ordinary Accentuation to be. In the time of Plautus final *-s* was pronounced so weakly as hardly to constitute 'position' before an initial consonant. *Scelus viri,* the common phrase of abuse, has always the second syllable short in his verses, with the metrical ictus on the first syllable, (where it must have been in ordinary speech,) and on the last, *scélu' virí* (Curc. 614, Mil. 1434, Truc. 621); and the lengthening by position of *-ĭs, -ŭs* in Plautus or any of the older Latin poets is the exception and not the rule. The endings of Most. 557 *sí confessŭs sít,* 1124 *lúdificátŭs sit,* Mil. 1184 *quíd factúrŭs sim,* Curc. 680 *expértŭs sum,* Merc. 232, 245 *vísŭs sum,* Pers. 144 *factúrŭs sís,* Asin. 286 *fraúdŭs sit,* 376 *factúrŭs sum* are scanned exactly as we should suppose them, on our hypothesis that *sum, sim,* etc. were joined as enclitic appendages to the Participle, to be pronounced, *confessŭ'-sit, factúrŭ'-sim, expértŭ'-sum,* and so on. We find the same treatment of phrases like *nullus sum, salvus sum,* where the word used in close connection with the Substantive Verb is an Adjective and not a Participle, in such endings as

núllŭs sum, Merc. 217, 978: *sálvŭs súm*, Most. 566; *sálvŭs sum*, Mil. 1343; *sálvŭs sis*, Rud. 104. This is the normal treatment of these phrases in Plautus, though we sometimes find the final *-ŭs* lengthened by position, e.g. Bacch. 1158 *tactús sum*, Pers. 24 *factús sum*. On the other hand when the final syllable of the Participle or Adjective is long by nature, or necessarily lengthened by position, it is the rule and not the exception that the metrical ictus should fall on it, Truc. 894 *ácceptúm sit*, Rud. 168 *salvaé sunt*, Pseud. 1036 *victór sum*, Aul. 88

paupér sum, fateor, pátior, quod di dánt, fero,

and in all probability this tallies with the sound which those expressions would have in ordinary talk, if, as we are assuming, they were treated as compound words *acceptum-sit*, *salvae-sunt*, etc.

The acceptance of this theory will remove at a stroke a number of Meyer's instances of discrepancy between ictus and accent; and if we extend the enclitic usage of *sum, sim* etc. to disyllabic forms of the Substantive Verb like *siem, sumus, fui, forem* etc., a very large amount of Plautine endings will be found to be not violations, but most careful observances of the usage of ordinary pronunciation. The usual place of these disyllabic forms of *sum, fui* &c. after a Participle or Adjective is at the end of the line, e.g. Capt. 254 *circummoénití sumus*, Men. 654 *défessí sumus*, Cas. 980 and Merc. 481 *óblitús fui*, Poen. 262 *gnatúm foret*, 285 *órnataé sumus*, Asin. 320 *salví sumus*, Aul. 229 *cóniunctús siem*, 405 *itidém fuat*, Mil. 170 *si óptandúm foret;* and this inclines one to keep *fuat* with the editors of the Ritschl text at the end of the first hemistich of the Iambic Octonarius in Amph. 985,

nec quísquam nunc tam audáx fuat || *homo qui óbviam obsistát mihi* (*om.* nunc MSS),

instead of placing it elsewhere, as Prof. Palmer in his recent edition of the play has done:

nec quísquam tam audax fúat homo, || *ut óbviam obsistát mihi.*

In the 3rd pers. plur. of the Perf. Ind. Pass. there seems to

be a tendency to keep the Participle and the Substantive Verb separate. Whether this is due to accident or design it is difficult to say, but it is certain that arrangements like Poen. 1346

eae súnt subruptae cúm nutrice párvolae,

or Epid. 206 *á legione omnés remissi* ‖ *súnt domum Thebís.*
Quis hoc
dícet factum?

are much more frequent than the immediate sequence of *sunt* after the participle in the same hemistich, as Poen. 954

quae míhi subruptae súnt, et fratris fílium

or ib. 222 *binaé singulís quae datae sunt ancíllae* (*d. nobis a.* MSS) (a bacchiac line).

A line of Terence shews us both arrangements,

Hec. prol. 21 *ubi sunt cógnitae*
placitaé sunt. ita poétam restitui ín locum.

A second group of 'Sentence Enclitics' is composed of

(2) the Possessive Pronouns, when unemphatic.

Here again the Romance languages come to our assistance. They shew us two series of possessive forms, the first sprung from emphatic *meus, mea, meum*, etc. of Vulgar Latin, the second from the same words used without stress and so reduced to *mus, mum, ma*, e.g. Ital. mo, ma, Fr. mon, ma, Span. mi, ma.

In Italian, padremo, 'my father,' shews us the latter, il mio padre the former variety.

The phrase *volŭptás mea*, which at the end of a line always has this metrical accentuation, while in the middle of a line it appears as *méa volúptas* (Klotz, Grundz. p. 92), and the malediction *vaé capití tuo* (so always in Plautus), warrant us, as we said before, in extending this enclisis of the unemphatic Possessive to phrases like *patér mi* Capt. 936, *fratér mi* Curc. 658, *matér mea* Aul. 690, 693, *fratrém meum* Aul. 694, and in assuming the coincidence of accent and ictus in a hundred other endings

of the kind. Here then is a second exception to the Grammarians' rule that a Latin word never has the accent on its final syllable. If it stands alone indeed, it has not; but in a sentence, when joined with a Possessive Pronoun, it may shift the accent to the final, so that the line quoted by Meyer,

fáciet, o vir óptume, o patér mi festivíssume,

gives the same metrical accentuation to the phrase *o pater mi* as that phrase would bear in everyday talk.

(3) That Personal, like Possessive, Pronouns had their emphatic and unemphatic pronunciation in Latin is so reasonable a proposition that we can afford to disregard the remark of Priscian XVII. 55, p. 141 H. (which may after all be only apparently and not really an obstacle), in favour of the clear evidence of the Romance languages, which shew us two series of Personal, as they do of Possessive, Pronouns, e.g. Ital. me, te emphatic; mi, ti unemphatic. These unemphatic forms are joined to the verb, e.g. prestatemi il libro, 'lend me the book'; and I cannot see any reason for doubting that something analogous took place in Latin. In Curc. 628

Phaédrome, obsecró, servá me. *Tánquam me et geniúm meum*

it is at least possible that the exclamation *serva me* has the metrical ictus on the same syllable as would bear the accent in ordinary speech (cf. Klotz, Grundzüge, p. 324), and similarly in Amph. 991

patér vocat me, eúm sequor, eius dícto imperio sum óbsequens,

though it is rare for two iambic words to be allowed to stand together in a line of Plautus, they may have been tolerated here on the ground that the ictus and accent clash only in the first word *pater*, but harmonize in the second *vocát* (*me*). (Klotz, ib. p. 327.)

Prepositions before monosyllabic Personal Pronouns normally take the metrical ictus in Plautus[1] (unless the pronoun is emphatic), e.g. Trin. 79

suspícionem et cúlpam ut ab se ségregent,

[1] This has not been sufficiently recognized by the editors of the Ritschl series.

where *ábse* is written in the best Palatine MS *apse*, as it would probably be pronounced.

Trin. 619 *úlciscare et míhi ut* ergá te *fui ét sum, referas grátiam.*

ib. 733 *sine dóte, quom eius rém* penés me *habeám domi.*

Stich. 415 *et is hódie* apúd me *cénat et fratĕr meus.*

And if we allow this to have been the pronunciation of every-day life we shall not regard the metrical accentuation of disyllabic prepositions like *erga, propter, penes, apud* before Pronouns on the final syllable as at variance with the ordinary accentuation of such phrases in common talk. The exclamations *vaé miseró mihi!, heú miseró mihi!, miserúm me!*, e.g. Ter. Adelph. 486

sció. Miserám me, *dífferor dolóribus*[1],

give other examples of this enclisis of the unemphatic Personal Pronoun.

(4) Auxiliary Verbs in Latin are shewn by the Tense-forms of the Romance nations and by the analogy of other languages to have been enclitic, as was remarked above in discussing the phrase *volŏ scíre*. We may include in the same category verbs which combine with a noun to express an action which might be expressed by a verb alone, e.g. *fidem do, dono dabo, operam dabo*, in which phrases we may suppose the verb to have resigned the accent in favour of the noun, just as we throw the stress on the noun 'noise' and not on the verb 'make' in the phrase 'to make a noise,' or perhaps we had better consider the verb and noun as forming a complex word, which is accented according to the ordinary rules of Latin accentuation, *fidém-do* or *dó-fidem*. If this be so, there will be a coincidence and not a conflict of accent and ictus in such lines as:

Ter. Adelph. 473 fidém dans, *iurans sé illam ducturúm domum.*

[1] The normal accentuation of this phrase, as we may see from Kellerhoff's list of examples (Studemund's Studien, II. p. 76 sq.), is *miserúm me!* or *me miserum!* Phorm. 749 stands alone in offering *miseram me!* The line runs, *ubi illáe sunt?* Miseram me! *Hém, quid est? vivóntne? Vivit gnáta.*

Phorm. 492 *nondúm mihi credis. Háriolare. Sín* fidém do? *Fábulae.*

Plaut. Mil. 455 dó fidem, *si omíttis, isto me íntro ituram, quó iubes.*

Ter. Andr. 243 *itane óbstinate* operám dat *ut me a Glýcerio miserum ábstrahat?*

and in the numerous endings of this kind: Ter. Eun. 564 *donó data,* Heaut. 110 *operám dabam;* as well as those which I mentioned above viz. *coctúm dabo* (= *coquam*), *factúm volo, faciás volo, missám face* (= *dimitte*). Cicero's story about Crassus mistaking the cry of a fig-seller *Cauneas! Cauneas!* (sc. *ficus vendo*) for *cave ne eas* (Div. II. 40), seems to shew that in ordinary talk this verbal phrase was treated as a word-complex with a single accent *cávĕ-n(e)-eas*, just as we have in Plautus, *cavĕ-fáxis* Mil. 1125, *cavĕ-pársis* Bacch. 910; and the reduction of other unemphatic verbs to mere members of a compound word is indicated by the traditional way of writing *quolibet, quamvis* and the like. *Sis*, whether derived from *si vis* or from *sino*, is an enclitic appendage of the imperative, e.g. *properá sis* (see Seyffert, Stud. Plaut.), as much as *dum* in *excúte dum* Aul. 646, *évocá dum* Most. 669, *aspíce dum* Most. 1105, and if *quámvis* and *quantúmvis* are allowed to be the natural accentuation, it is difficult to see why an ending like *quantúm volo* should be quoted as a case of conflict between metrical ictus and ordinary accent.

These last examples suggest a fifth class of Enclitics.

(5) Nouns of subordinate meaning, like *res, modus* and so on. In English 'thing,' 'kind,' 'state,' 'part' are used in this way without stress, as Mr Sweet has pointed out in his Primer of English Phonetics, in such sentences as 'something of that kind,' 'some parts of England.' That *modus* was so used in Latin we see from the traditional spelling *quomodo*, which surely ought to prevent us from believing that in Ter. Hec. 179

miris modis *odísse coepit Sóstratam,*

there is any discrepancy between ictus and accent. That the same is true of *res* we see from the fact that the phrase *ei*

rei operam dabam has in Plautus this normal form *ēi r(ēi) operám dabam* (Seyffert, Stud. Plaut. p. 25 *n.*). So that the metrical accentuation of the final syllable of *tantam* in Trin. 682 may, as Klotz (after Ritschl) has pointed out (Grundz. p. 324), coincide with the natural accentuation of the word-complex *tantám-rem* (like *qua-re*),

mé qui abusus súm tantám rem *pátriam, porro in dítiis ésse agrumque habére,*

and the usual accentuation of *malam rem* in Plautus, e.g. Trin. 1045

Hércle istis malám rem *magnam móribus dignámst dari,*

may have been that of everyday speech. Cf. *bonaé rēi*, Stich. 379.

The word *homo* in such a phrase as *quis hic homo est?* would not have the same weight as the Interrogative Pronoun. It is not so necessary to the sentence as the pronoun, and might be omitted without the meaning being altered. Seyffert (Berl. Phil. Woch. 1891, p. 108) has found that the phrase in Plautus always bears this metrical form *quís hic homást*, and we can imagine that a Roman who used this phrase uttered it in a single breath with the main accent on the first word. Similarly I cannot doubt that in a line like Amph. 327,

íllic homo *á me síbi malám rem arcéssit iúmentó suo,*

there is exact correspondence of ictus with accent. *Vir* takes a like subordinate position in the phrase *scélŭs virí* (so always), and *locus* in an adverbial complex like *úbi locí?, intereá loci* (Donatus ad Ter. Eun. 255), *dies* in *propediem* (Donatus ad Ter. Ad. 878), *quotídie, postrídie.* Gellius (N. A. x. 24) says that in the time of Cicero and the earlier period the phrase *diequinte* or *diequinti* was in vogue, 'pro adverbio copulate dictum, secunda in eo syllaba correpta,' and we may guess that *dies* formed a compound with *triginta* (*viginti*) from the fact that these two numerals are perhaps never found in Plautus and Terence with the ictus on the last syllable, except when *dies* (or *minae*) follows, e.g.

Men. 951 *út ego te pendéntem fŏliam stímulis trigintá dies.*

where the last two words seem to make a compound noun, like our 'fortnight,' 'twelvemonth.'

This hypothesis of word-complexes with a single accent will remove a great many seeming examples of conflict between ictus and accent from Plautus' lines. The phrase of everyday life *nil moror* 'I do not care' appears in his dramas with the ictus, never on the second syllable, but always on the first; and we can hardly be wrong in guessing that a Roman would have uttered the words in this way with a single accent and that on the important word of the phrase, the word *nil*. It is not impossible that the Relative Pronoun, in cases of Anastrophe, where instead of taking its usual place at the beginning of a dependent sentence it is put after some other word, may have been in ordinary pronunciation joined with this prefixed word into a compound phrase. This compound, unless the prefixed word was specially emphasized, would receive the same accentuation as a single word. This is the usual metrical treatment of such a case in Plautus and Terence, as the following examples, taken from Terence's prologues, will shew:

Andr. prol. 26 posthác quas *faciet de íntegro comoédias*
Heaut. prol. 6 dupléx quae *ex arguménto facta est símplici*
" 43 *nam nunc* novás qui *scríbunt, nihil parcúnt seni*
Hec. prol. 12 novás qui *exactas féci ut inveteráscerent;*

and although definite proof is wanting, there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that the pronunciation of these words took a similar course.

Quintilian (Inst. Or. I. 5. 25), in discussing the pronunciation of Prepositions before Nouns, remarks that the ordinary account given by Grammarians, viz. that the Preposition becomes oxytone, is untrue; for what really happens is that the Preposition and Noun are fused into a compound word: nam cum dico 'circumlítora,' tanquam unum enuntio dissimulata distinctione, itaque tanquam in una voce una est acuta. This is generally understood to imply that the Preposition was accentless, the Noun accented in Latin, so that in the case of monosyllabic or disyllabic iambic Nouns the accentuation would be *in rém, in spém, in iús, in máre, in lócum, ob víam.* What

Quintilian's remark really does imply is precisely the opposite, *ín rem, ín spem, ín ius, ín mare, ín locum, ób viam*, for he says that the two words are to be made into one, and accented as a single word. The analogy of other languages is in favour of the consistent accentuation of the Noun. The metrical treatment of these phrases by Plautus and Terence would harmonise with the accentuation of the Preposition, e.g. *ín rem* Hec. 102, 834, 249, *ín re* Hec. 666, *áb re* Ad. 830, *pró re* Ad. 809. *praetér spem* Ad. 815, Phorm. 239, 246, 251, 1048, in support of which we may quote the common phrase *quamobrem*, which in the Dramatists has the metrical ictus on the penultimate syllable. Again, with disyllabic iambic or pyrrhic Nouns: *ín mare* Bacch. 458, Truc. 564, *tráns mare* Merc. 354, *pér mare* Merc. 371, *ád mare* Poen. 627, 295, 898, *proptér mare* Rud. prol. 34, *quód ĕst anté pedes* Ennius Trag. 201 (but cf. Probus Inst. p. 149 K.). We have indeed in Curc. 55 in the Ritschl edition:

e núce nuculeum qui ésse volt, frangít nucem,

but this reading (which departs too from another usage of the Dramatists, the accentuation of the first syllable of Fourth Paeon words like *nŭcŭlĕum*) has not the support of the MSS. They read *qui e nuce nucleum*, and Macrobius quotes the line as *qui e nuce nuculeos*, so that Prof. Goetz's reading is to say the least very uncertain. In the Vidularia (Plaut. Frag. ed. Winter, v. 181), the Ambrosian Palimpsest seems to read *in ópus*:

in ópus ut sese cóllocavit quám cito;

but the metrical accentuation of the Preposition in such phrases is undoubtedly the rule with Plautus and Terence. The adverbs *invicem, obviam, admodum, denuo* (= *de novo*), *sedulo* (= *se, sine dolo*), suggest that it may also have been the accent of pronunciation, although we know from a passage of Gellius (VI. 7) that *ad módum, ad fátim* was the pronunciation of his own time. Gellius however mentions this in connection with a theory of some Grammarians that at an earlier period the pronunciation was *ádmodum, ádfatim*, so that his evidence tends as much one way as the other.

If we allow the accentuation of the Preposition before disyllabic (iambic or pyrrhic) Nouns in the time of Plautus, a

large number of line-endings will be redeemed from the charge of bringing ictus into conflict with accent, *cúm sene* Mil. 966, *ín caput* Capt. 89, and the like. But even if we resign this hypothesis, as too doubtful, the rules which we have already mentioned for the shifting of the accent in certain collocations will be found to remove an astonishingly large number of these adverse examples, which are used by Meyer in support of his theory, and are admitted by Ritschl to be exceptions to his own. The great obstacle in the way of recognizing an accentual element in the Dramatists' versification lies in their use of iambic words, which can only appear in their verse with the ictus on the last syllable, unless the metrical licence of shortening the last syllable is resorted to; and such a metrical accentuation must be allowed to produce as strong a conflict between ictus and accent as can well be imagined—*vólo* accent, *voló* ictus. Now if we apply our rules to the examples of such metrical accentuation as *voló* collected by Leppermann in his monograph: de correptione vocabulorum [natura] iambicorum quae apud Plautum in senariis atque septenariis iambicis et trochaicis invenitur, 1890, we shall see how many of them are found on our hypotheses to concur, instead of conflicting, with ordinary pronunciation. To take a single play, the Stichus, the best preserved of all the plays in the Ambrosian Palimpsest, we find that, of the 50 instances he quotes, some 30 fall under the categories already mentioned: e.g.

v. 771 *fac tu* hóc modó. *At tu* hóc modó (pronounced *hócmodo*, like *quómodo*),

v. 366 *hic hércle* homó *nimium sapit* (pronounced *hic hércle homo*, with no accent on the first syllable of the unimportant word *homo*),

v. 621 *éxorabo aliquó* modó (pronounced *aliquó-modo*),

v. 757 *iám vos dáte bibát tibícini* (*dáte-bibat* pronounced with one accent, and that on the first syllable of *date*).

Iambic words at the ends of lines are not included in Leppermann's lists, but if we examine, say the first 200 lines of the Stichus, we shall be convinced that a large proportion of these

too can be proved on our hypotheses to have had in ordinary pronunciation no accent on the first syllable: e.g.

v. 160 *plús annós* decém (*annós-decem* a compound, like *quattuór-decim, diequínti*),

v. 182 *sí qui essúm* vocát (*essúm-vocat* a compound verbal phrase),

v. 191 *díffractós* velím (*velim* subordinated to the Participle).

Ritschl therefore made an unnecessary concession to his opponents, when he allowed that in the last Dipody of Iambic lines the reconciliation of accent and ictus was through metrical necessity hardly possible. Endings like *essúm vocát*, so far from offering a double example of departure from the accent of common pronunciation, are really examples in favour of his theory[1]. And the argument drawn from Plautus' use of Iambic words, with ictus on the final, at the middle or beginning of a line, is seen to have really much less force than it has hitherto got credit for. We must not go so far as to say that Plautus never throws the ictus on the last syllable, unless the accent would fall there in ordinary speech, but we may assert with confidence that he shews a marked tendency to reconcile the accent and the ictus in these words, in which of all others the reconciliation was most difficult to effect. He places Iambic words in collocations where the accent would naturally be shifted to the last syllable, either such as have been already mentioned, or before enclitic particles like *que, ve, ne;* he elides their final vowel; or, where less violent means are impossible, he resorts to the metrical licence of shortening their last syllable. The residue of conflicting instances are generally words at the end of the first hemistich of a long Iambic line, or before some other pause in the sen-

[1] It should be added that we seldom find the Iambic words at the end of a line to be the important words of a sentence, as in Stich. 260

nullán tibi linguast? Quaé quidem dicát 'dabo'
veterém reliqui: eccíllam quae dicát 'cedo.'

They are generally unimportant words, e.g. Stich. 200

quibus ípsis nullast rés quam procurént sua,

where *sua* would in rapid utterance have hardly any perceptible accent.

tence, where the disagreement of accent and ictus would probably not be so marked, e.g.

Trin. 2 sequór. *sed finem fóre quem dicam néscio,*

and sometimes before the last Dipody of an Iambic Senarius, e.g. Aul. 581,

atque ístuc aurum quód tibí *concréditumst.*

So much for the class of words which are the hardest to reconcile with Ritschl's theory, the Iambic words. Let us now examine those which exhibit a different prosodical form. Tribrach words, e.g. *genera,* are, as we have seen, wholly in support of the theory. The metrical accentuation *genéra,* undoubtedly difficult to reconcile with the natural pronunciation *génera,* is unknown in Plautus and Terence. Dactyl words, e.g. *optima,* offer a support almost equally strong. In the plays of Terence they never have the ictus on the second syllable. In the dialogue metres of Plautus they have only occasionally, and that only in one position, viz. the first foot of an Iambic line. Perhaps equally rare is the metrical accentuation of First Paeon words like *făcĭlĭus,* on the second syllable. Meyer indeed quotes words like *bálineae, fácilius,* etc., as examples of conflict between ictus and accent, taking for granted that in the time of Plautus such words were accented, as they were at a later time, on the antepenultimate syllable. But the regularity with which these words have the ictus on the first syllable in Plautus[1] and the older Dramatists can hardly be accounted for except on the supposition that they were pronounced in the early period with the accent on the first syllable. The later form *balneae* shews that this was the accentuation of *balineae,* just as Horace's *puertia* shews that *pueritia* had the same syllable accented as has the metrical ictus in the single instance of the word in Plautus or Terence, *puéritia,* Ter. Heaut. 183; and the occurrence of the spelling OPITVMA for *optima* in an early inscription (C. I. L. I. 1016) suggests that a good many Dactyl words owe their trisyllabic

[1] This too has not been sufficiently recognized by the editors of the Ritschl series.

form to contractions of First Paeon words, contractions caused by the accent falling on the first syllable. Choriambic words, e.g. *imperium, consilium*, are put by Meyer in the same category with these First Paeon words. But while the metrical accentuation *facílius, balíneae* is so rare in Plautus and Terence as to afford ground for suspicion that a line in which it occurs requires emendation, or is a later addition, or else owes its present form to a subsequent recension of the plays, we find *consílium, ímpérium* more frequently than *cónsilium, imperium* in their lines[1], but neither accentuation at all so normal as that of First Paeon words. Now there is no reason to doubt that in the time of Plautus these words had the accent, where they had it in the time of the Grammarians, on the second syllable, *consílium, ímpérium*, so that the metrical accentuation *cónsilium, imperium*, whenever it occurs, must be regarded as an offence, though not a very heinous one, against the rules of ordinary pronunciation, except indeed in such phrases as Stich. 73 *cónsiliúm-dabo*, 58 *ófficiúm-suum*. But there is a theory recently broached by Prof. Thurneysen about these quadrisyllabic words, which, if true, may induce us to consider such an accentuation as *cónsilium* in Plautus to be not wholly inconsistent with a regard for the ordinary accentuation of his time. Prof. Thurneysen, in his account of the Saturnian Verse (Der Saturnier, 1885), adopting the view that this verse is entirely accentual, and not quantitative, has drawn attention to the fact that, beside the main accent of a polysyllabic word, there is usually a secondary, or subordinate, accent which is taken account of by the Saturnian metre. This secondary accent falls on the first syllable of the word, so that we find these polysyllables in the lines of Livius Andronicus and Naevius (the contemporary of Plautus), exhibiting an accentuation like this: *tèmpestátibus, ònerárium, Mèrcúrius*. Four- and five-syllabled words are found with this double accent, but not

[1] According to Ritschl (Prolegomena, Opusc. v. p. 448). I find that *flagitium*, for example, has the ictus on the first syllable 10 times in Plautus, and on the second syllable 10 times, not to count the phrase *flagítium hóminis*, which occurs 4 times, and always with the metrical accentuation I have indicated.

trisyllables, except *aètátem* which, though spelt as a trisyllable, exhibits the accentuation of the old quadrisyllable *aèvitátem*. If Thurneysen's account be correct, words like *consilium, flagitium*, would in the Saturnian Verse of Plautus' time bear the accentuation *cònsílium, flàgítium;* and it is quite conceivable that this accentuation was not a mere traditionary usage of the Saturnian poets, but corresponded to something in actual pronunciation. We know that at some early period all Latin words, like Celtic and Teutonic words, were accented on the first syllable. The change from this to the classical usage of keeping the accent on the antepenultimate or penultimate syllable would be brought about gradually, when begun and when ended we do not know; and in the case of polysyllables would probably take the form of giving to a secondary accent, which had sprung up on the penult or antepenult, the predominance which had hitherto belonged to the accent on the first syllable. *Témpestàtibus* would become *tèmpestátibus, óneràriae* would become *ònerárìae, cónsìlium* etc. *cònsílium* etc. Now the accentuation of First Paeon words like *facilius* on the first syllable in Plautus seems to shew that in his time the 'paenultima law' was still resisted in one class of words, and makes it possible that the change to the new accentuation in Choriambic words was not of such long standing that all trace of the older accentuation had been entirely obliterated. In pronouncing words like *consilium, imperium*, a Roman of Plautus' time may have given to the first syllable just so much accentuation as would be reckoned a secondary accent in a Saturnian line, and would in an Iambic or Trochaic line make the incidence of metrical ictus on the same syllable appear no very strong violation of the ordinary pronunciation.

This hypothesis however cannot pretend to be more than a possible one; and I question whether even so much can be said for another which would, if accepted, have a great effect in reconciling ictus and accent in the lines of Plautus and Terence. I refer to the theory of Bentley and Hermann that in reading Latin poetry the accent was shifted a syllable nearer the beginning of a word when the final syllable was elided, so as to produce in a line like Ter. Andr. prol. 1

poéta cúmprim(um) ánim(um) ad scríbend(um) áppulit

an exact correspondence of accent and ictus. For by this theory *cumprímum* would become by the elision of the final *cúmprim(um)*, and *scribéndum* would be pronounced *scríbend(um)* from the same cause. Ritschl in his Prolegomena (Opusc. v. p. 452) makes this retraction of the accent arbitrary, not necessary, *scríbend(um) appulit* or *scribénd(um) appulit*; and Klotz explains by means of it some phenomena of Plautine versification [Grundz. p. 82 (*proféct(o)*); p. 265 (*pulcrá vider(e) obsecro*); p. 332 (*póstrem(o) hunc* at beginning of trochaic line)]. It is undoubtedly true that a large number of Molossus words, like *scrībēndŭm*, and Choriambic words, like *cōnsĭlĭŭm*, which have the ictus (unlike the accent) on the first syllable, have their last syllable elided in Plautus and Terence. But a more natural explanation of this is that the Dramatists felt *scríbend(um)* to be less at variance with the ordinary accentuation *scribéndum* than *scríbendúm*, with a double discrepancy of ictus and accent, would be. *Cónmutém*, as we saw above, would not be allowed in the metrically important part of an Iambic Dipody, but *cónmut(em)* would be tolerated, presumably because it does not fly in the face of ordinary pronunciation so violently as a Molossus word with ictus on the last as well as on the first syllable[1]. This account seems to me at least quite as likely as the other, which has hardly anything to support it except a questionable analogy in Greek accentuation, and which, so far from being mentioned by the Latin Grammarians, would seem to be contradicted by some of their statements (e.g. Priscian VII. 18, p. 302, 16 H.). Donatus in his note on Terence Eun. 437

scin síquando illa méntionem Phaédriae
facit

[1] *Bácchanál* in Aul. 413

attát perii hercle egó miser: aperítur
bacchanál, adest (MSS *aperit*)

should not be quoted as an example of ictus and accent conflicting. These Neuters in *-al*, *-ar* would probably have the accent on the final in Plautus' time, as we see from *colŭmbar* in frag. 249 *nón ego te novi, navalis scríba*, cólumbar *ínpudens* (MSS *columbari*). Between *exemplāre* of the older period and Horace's *exémplăr* must have intervened an accentuation *exemplár*.

remarks that there is a different shade of meaning expressed by *síquando* and by *siquándo;* but his remark would lose all its point if *siquándo*, when its last syllable was elided, as it is in this line, assumed, by the customary method of reading a line of Latin poetry, the accentuation *síquando*. It is indeed possible that some word-groups, like *pleriqu(e)-omnes*, may have exhibited in ordinary pronunciation the accentuation *plériqu(e)-ómnes*, and this accentuation of ordinary life we should expect to find, and do find, followed in the metre of the Dramatists, but that it was a usage in reciting Latin Poetry to retract invariably, or at will, the accent of a word whose last syllable was elided, is too startling a hypothesis to accept without definite proof.

W. M. LINDSAY.

LUCRETIANUM.

MUNRO on Lucr. III. 1011 *Cerberus et furiae iam uero et lucis egestas* says, "After 1011 I believe some verses are lost: both the words of Servius to Aen. VI. 596 and his context prove to me that he is speaking of Lucretius, not of Virgil, as Bernays affirms in Rhein. Mus. n. f. v. p. 584, when he says, 'per rotam autem ostendit negotiatores qui semper tempestatibus turbinibusque uoluuntur."

The passage of Servius is as follows:

Sane de his omnibus rebus mire reddit rationem Lucretius et confirmat in nostra uita esse omnia quae finguntur de inferis. dicit namque Tityon amorem esse, hoc est libidinem, quae secundum physicos et medicos in iecore est, sicut risus in splene, iracundia in felle: unde etiam exesum a uulture dicitur in poenam renasci: etenim libidini non satis fit re semel peracta, sed recrudescit semper, unde ait Horatius *incontinentis aut Tityi iecur*. ipse etiam Lucretius dicit per eos, super quos iam iam casurus imminet lapis, superstitiosos significari, qui inaniter semper uerentur et de diis et caelo superioribus male opinantur: nam religiosi sunt qui per reuerentiam timent. per eos autem qui saxum uoluunt ambitum uult et repulsam significari, quia semel repulsi petitores ambire non desinunt. per rotam autem ostendit negotiatores, qui semper tempestatibus turbinibusque uoluuntur.

The natural meaning of Servius is, I think, decidedly as Munro believed. If in the words *per rotam autem ostendit*, &c. he had meant to speak of Virgil, clearness of statement would have made it imperative to mention his name.

In a MS.[1] of the XIth or XIth century of Macrobius' Somnium Scipionis I have found a confirmation of this view in some scholia, undoubtedly coeval with the text, written in the margins of the page containing S. S. I. 10. § 12. Ipsam quoque poenarum descriptionem de ipso usu conuersationis humanae sumptam crediderunt: uulturem *iecur immortale tondentem* nihil aliud intellegi uolentes quam tormenta conscientiae obnoxia flagitio uiscera interiora rimantis, et ipsa uitalia indefessa admissi sceleris ammonitione laniantis, semperque curas, si requiescere forte temptauerint, excitantis tamquam fibris renascentibus inhaerendo, nec ulla sibi miseratione parcentis lege hac qua *se iudice nemo nocens absoluitur* nec de se suam potest uitare sententiam. Illos aiunt epulis ante ora positis excruciari fame et tabescere, quos magis magisque adquirendi desiderium cogit praesentem copiam non uidere, et in affluentia inopes egestatis mala in ubertate patiuntur, nescientes parta respicere, dum egent habendis: illos radiis rotarum pendere districtos qui nihil consilio praeuidentes, nihil ratione moderantes, nihil uirtutibus explicantes, seque et actus omnes suos fortunae permittentes, casibus et fortuitis semper rotantur: saxum ingens uoluere inefficacibus laboriosisque conatibus uitam terentes: atram silicem lapsuram semper et cadenti similem illorum capitibus imminere qui arduas potestates et infaustam ambiunt tyrannidem numquam sine timore uicturi, et cogentes subiectum uulgus *odisse dum metuat*, semper sibi uidentur exitium quod merentur excipere.

Macrobius here is mainly explaining Virgil, Aen. VI. 595—620, according to the allegorical interpretations which had descended from a remote past to his own time. There is no distinct reference to Lucretius as the source of these explanations, and it is therefore a remarkable circumstance that the margins of the leaf in the MS. of the S. Scipionis containing I. 10. 12 sqq. call attention in a very signal way to *Lucretius*.

Opposite the words *uulturem iecur immortale—obnoxia flagitio* in the left margin is *aliter Lucretius libidinem*, in the right margin *Sane de his omnibus mire reddidit rationem*

[1] MS. Auct. T. 2. 27 once in possession of the Jesuits.

Lucretius. dicit enim tition libidinem significari quae in iecore est vulturem autem cum subit renouari quia libido semper recrudescit.

Again, opposite the words § 14 *illos radiis rotarum—semper rotantur*, in the left margin is *Aliter Lucretius negotiatoris qui ambire non desinunt:* in the right *Aliter Lucretius superstitiosos qui inaniter uerentur et de diis male opinantur.*

It is obvious that the writer drew these scholia from Servius on Aen. VI. 596. But whereas Servius, from Lucr. III. 977 sqq., gives four explanations: (1) of *Tityos* as love, (2) of *Tantalus'* impending rock as superstition, (3) of *Sisyphus'* stone rolled up a mountain only to roll down it again as ambition and its disappointments, (4) of the revolving wheel as trade with its countless tossings in storm and tempest; the writer of our MS. of Macrobius has only given *three:* (1) of Tityos, (2) of the wheel, (3) of the impending rock, and the two last of these indistinctly, for *both* the references are written opposite the same words of Macrobius, § 14, *illos radiis rotarum—semper rotantur*. But the fact that, in quoting the passage of Servius, the writer of the scholia has *four times* mentioned Lucretius *by name*, is very significant of his belief that Lucretius alone, and not Virgil, is meant by Servius all through.

Munro suggested that the lacuna after 1011 may well have mentioned Cocytus and Acheron. Macrobius, whether he is drawing from Lucretius or from some other source, in that part of the chapter which immediately precedes § 12 (sections 10, 11), gives similar allegorical interpretations of the river of Lethe, of Phlegethon, of *Acheron*, of *Cocytus*, of Styx.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

NOTES ON PLUTARCH, DE ISIDE ET OSIRIDE.

This treatise, deliberately neglected by Cobet because its subject was distasteful to him, is, nevertheless, of considerable interest, and the frequency with which it is quoted in works dealing with Egyptian religion is a sufficient indication that the stones and papyri have not made its study nugatory. The text of our MSS is not a good one. They all derive from an archetype inferior to the text used by Eusebius, as the portions quoted by him (ch. 25, and part of ch. 32) show: such variants as *φθόγγοι* for the correct *φυγαί* (Euseb.) and *δυναμένων* for the correct *δοκούντων* (Euseb.) would seem to indicate that the text from which all our MSS derive had either been deliberately changed (for the worse in these two cases), or that it had been restored from a MS in bad condition: it is difficult to account otherwise for such marked divergencies[1]. All the extant MSS seem to agree in these and many other obviously false readings. One of the Laurentian MSS (plut. 80, cod. 21 = Parthey's G) distinguishes itself by giving a good original reading in two places, ch. 20, 359 A *ἐχειτῖνον* from which Holwerda restores with certainty *Διοχίτην*, and ch. 30, 363 A, *μηδὲ ὄνῳ* for *μὴ δεομένω*; but, on the other hand, its *σώματος* for *σπέρματος* (ch. 34, 364 D) is a bad correction, and in many other places its variations are unintelligent or careless. Parthey's edition of the *De Iside et Osiride*, which gives a collation of the Laurentian MSS and the standard Paris E, is so far a blessing, but, in the absence of a critical edition of the *Moralia*, it would be idle

[1] The superiority of the text used by Eusebius is even more marked in the passages he quotes from the *De Defectu Oraculorum*. See especially 417 D.

to attempt to estimate the value of the different MSS which contain this treatise. It is at least evident that the Vulgate may with justice be drastically treated, if disease be manifest, the archetype which it represents being a text not so much perverted by scribes' errors as by deliberate correction or restoration[1].

The new Teubner edition of the *Moralia* (3 vols. published) is unhappily of very little service, and this is the more to be regretted as its editor, Mr Bernardakis, has collated many MSS (see his preface to vol. 1). The defects of this edition have been pointed out by competent critics; it is sufficient to say that it neither gives a readable text, nor an adequate *materia critica*, and that the text given is constructed on no apparent principle. As however it is the most easily procurable text, I would take it as a basis and point out some of those passages which either must, or, in my opinion, should be, if not emended, marked as corrupt. Mr Bernardakis has, it may be remarked, undoubtedly emended the text of the *Moralia* in a certain number of instances. In this treatise the only successful emendations I can find (apart from merely formal corrections) are in ch. 42 ad fin. *ὃ δὲ λέγουσιν ἕτερον ὄνομα*, for *ὃ λέγουσι. τὸ δ' ἕτερον ὄνομα*, and in ch. 81 *ἀναδομάτων* for *ἀναλωμάτων*.

I add some conjectures and remarks of my own.

Ch. 1, 351 D E: *οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἣν ὁ θεὸς εἴληχεν, εὔδαιμον εἶναι τὸ τῇ γνώσει μὴ προαπολείπειν τὰ γιγνόμενα.* Wyttenbach has proposed *τὰ γιγνωσκόμενα*, a suggestion deserving mention. In any case the sense is "The beatitude of God's eternal life lies in this, that his faculty of knowing is always provided with objects to be known." *τὸ τῆς γνώσεως μὴ προαπ.* would give a nearly equivalent sense "that his faculty of knowing does not outlast its objects." After *εἶναι*, the insertion of *τοῦτο* would improve the sentence.

Ch. 2, 351 F: *ὡς τοὔνομά γε φράζειν ἔοικε παντὸς μᾶλλον*

[1] The latter is very evident in the *De Pythiae Oraculis*. If we glance over the lacunae (for this purpose the Aldine edition where they are marked by blanks is best) we find they are in most cases such as could not be conjecturally restored and would be left blank by the editor of a mutilated inscription. It is evident that numerous other lacunae have been conjecturally filled up, in this case by a very intelligent restorer.

αὐτῇ τὸ εἰδέναι καὶ τὴν ἐπιστήμην προσήκουσαν. This will not construe. The MSS give *ὡς τοὔνομά τε.* Reiske suggested *ἧς τοὔνομά γε.* Bernardakis follows Dübner in adopting *γε*, retaining *ὡς*. In doing so he is probably right, but he should have quoted Reiske's conjecture as a whole in his note. The passage should be marked as corrupt; for we must, if we retain *ὡς*, either assume a lacuna, or change *προσήκουσαν* to a *nom. neut.* agreeing with *τοὔνομα*; e.g. *προσεικάζον.*

Ibid., infra: *τοῖς τελουμένοις ὁσιώσεως*, Bernardakis' conjecture, is as impossible a phrase as *τοῖς τελουμένοις θειώσεως*, the Vulgate which he prints. Reiske conjectured *διὰ θειώσεως*, and *δι' ὁσιώσεως* gives a still better sense. It is worthy of remark that Amyot's translation "ceux qui aspirent à se déifier, &c." shows that he read, perhaps conjecturally, *ἀντεχομένοις* (?) for *τελουμένοις*, and afterwards *κολούουσι* and *ἐθιζομένοις* for *κολουούσαις* and *ἐθιζούσης.*

Ibid., 352 A: *ὃν ἡ θεὸς παρακαλεῖ ζητεῖν παρ' αὐτῇ καὶ μετ' αὐτῆς ὄντα καὶ συνόντα.* Either omit the first *καὶ*, or read *παρ' αὐτῆς ἀεὶ μετ' αὐτῆς ὄντα καὶ συνόντα.* The sense is "whom (i.e. Osiris) the goddess bids us seek through herself (or "in her temples"), since he abides with her and possesses her."

Ch. 3, 352 B: *διὸ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἑρμουπόλει Μουσῶν τὴν πρωτέραν Ἶσιν ἅμα καὶ Δικαιοσύνην καλοῦσι σοφὴν οὖσαν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, καὶ δεικνύουσαν τὰ θεῖα κτλ.* The MSS have *σοφίαν.* It does not seem to have been observed that we have here, as *δεικνύουσαν* shows, a playful etymological study of *Δικαιοσύνη.* We should, I think, restore *σοφίᾳ συνοῦσαν.* Then *ὥσπερ εἴρηται* refers to the last passage discussed.

Ibid., infra: the true *ἱεραφόροι* and *ἱεροστόλοι* are *οἱ τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον περὶ θεῶν...ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ φέροντες ὥσπερ ἐν κίστῃ καὶ περιστέλλοντες, τὰ μὲν μέλανα καὶ σκιώδη, τὰ δὲ φανερὰ καὶ λαμπρὰ τῆς περὶ θεῶν ὑποδηλοῦντες οἰήσεως, οἷα καὶ περὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν ἱερὰν ἀποφαίνεται.* The MSS have *ὑποδηλοῦντα*: the correction *ὑποδηλοῦντες* is taken from Amyot, but Amyot also inserted a *καὶ* before *τὰ μὲν μέλανα*, and *ὑποδηλοῦντες* is not otherwise admissible; for the concealment of the *ἱερὸς λόγος* cannot symbolize the mixture of darkness and brightness in our notions of the gods. This is symbolized by the colours

of the Isiac vestments white and black: white vestments were the rule: for black see *post*, 372 E (*τὰ μελανόστολα ἀγάλματα*), and the Isiac *μελανηφόροι* at Delos (Lafaye, *Histoire du Culte des divinités d'Alexandrie hors de l'Égypte*, p. 147). Cp. also Appuleius' description of Isis in a vision. (*Metam.* XI. 240) Multicolor bysso tenui praetexta, nunc albo candore lucida, nunc crocco flore lutea, nunc roseo rubore flammida. Et quae longe longeque meum confutabat obtutum palla nigerrima. I should therefore suggest here the insertion (with Amyot) of *καὶ* before *τὰ μὲν μέλανα*, and, in the last clause, *οἷα τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν ἱερὰν ἀποφαίνεται.*

Ch. 4, 352 E: *καρπὸν ἐδώδιμον.* Linseed is edible, but it is difficult to see why *this quality* makes flax preferable to wool. Perhaps the "inter optimas fruges terra exorta" of Appuleius (*Apol.* 496, quoted by W.[1]) sufficiently defends the text: but, if not, *ἀνώδυνον*, referring to linseed-poultices, might be suggested.

Ch. 5, 353 A: *λέγονται δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἆπιν ἐκ φρέατος ἰδίου ποτίζειν, τοῦ δὲ Νείλου παντάπασιν ἀπείργειν* (sc. *τὸν Ἆπιν*). If *οὐδ' ἑαυτούς* below has any force we require here *τὸν δὲ Νεῖλον παντάπασιν ἀπειπεῖν*, but the tense is then, perhaps, wrong, and we may regard *οὐδ' ἑαυτούς* as an otiose addition. I should in this case suggest *τὸν δὲ Νεῖλον—ἀπείργειν*, "prevent Nile water from penetrating to Apis' well."

Ch. 6, 353 B: *οἱ δ' ἄλλοι.* Amyot, who translates "ailleurs les prêtres en boivent," read *ἄλλοθι*, and certainly, if we translate *οἱ μὲν ἐν Ἡλίου πόλει θεραπεύοντες τὸν θεὸν* "those who worship the god in Heliopolis," *ἄλλοθι* is necessary; for *ἄλλοι* would, or at least might, then mean "the other Heliopolitans"; but I believe that we should translate "The people of Heliopolis out of respect for their god," and in this case *ἄλλοι* can only mean "the other Egyptians."

Ibid.: *οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ μετρητὸν ἔπινον ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων.* I cannot see the force of *καὶ*, but its presence must be explained, if possible. If the text originally stood *οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς ἐκ μετρητῶν ἔπινον τῶν ἱερῶν*, and if *μετρητῶν* had

[1] W. gives here *opertui quoque in rebus sacris: rebus sacris* without *in*, as given in Oudendorp's edition, is certainly right.

been altered to *μετρητὸν*, it is not difficult to see how the present text would have arisen.

Ch. 7, 353 E: *ἐκ πυρὸς*. Wyttenbach's conjecture *ἔκφυλον* should have been mentioned.

Ch. 8, 353 E: Plutarch must have written, not *ἐγκατεστοιχειοῦτο*, but *ἐγκατεστοιχειῶται*.

Ch. 10, 355 A: *καρδίᾳ θυμὸν ἐσχάρας ὑποκειμένης*: Bernardakis' suggestion *βωμίου ἐσχάρας* is very much worse than many others (to be found in Parthey's edition) which he ignores. An *ἐσχάρα* is a different thing from a *βωμός*, and the phrase is out of the question in prose. No one seems to have suggested *θυμιώσης ἐσχάρας*, which is possible. Cp. *ἄνθρακες θυμιῶντες* (Theophr. *de Ign.* 75, quoted by L. and S.—not in the Thesaurus).

Ch. 12, *ad in.*: *λέγεται*: we should certainly correct *οὗτος* here to *οὕτως* (with Baxter and Reiske): then is not *λεγέσθω* required?

Ibid., 355 E: for *ἐπαγομένας*, perhaps *ἐπαγωγίμους*: cp. *μὴν ἐμβόλιμος*.

Ch. 13, 356 B: *συνωμότας ἄνδρας...πεποιημένον*. Is not *προσπεποιημένον* required?

Ch. 13, 356 C: *τὰ μὲν γόμφοις καταλαβόντας ἔξωθεν, τῶν δὲ θερμὸν μόλυβδον καταχεαμένους*, as given by Parthey, does less violence to the text, and is in every way better than *τῶν μὲν...καταλαβόντων κ.τ.λ.*, as given by B.

Ch. 14, 356 E: *οὐδένα προσελθεῖν ἀπροσαύδητον*: Bentley's *παρελθεῖν* should certainly be received into the text.

Ibid.: *αἰσθομένην δὲ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ἐρῶντα συγγεγονέναι δι' ἄγνοιαν ὡς ἑαυτῇ τὸν Ὄσιριν, καὶ τεκμήριον ἰδοῦσαν κ.τ.λ.* Here *ἐρῶντα* (for which the MSS give *ἐρῶντας*) is certainly, as Squire points out, wrong. Our MSS are very much astray here, as the mistakes *μὲν λατῖνον* for *μελιλώτινον*, and *ἐκεῖνο* for *ἐκθεῖναι*, show. Some designation of locality or occasion is required. The locality of Osiris' union with Nephthys was, as we learn from ch. 38, the extremity of Egypt, the sea-shore (where Isis is now searching for Osiris); but I cannot find any probable substitute for *ἐρῶντα* which will express this. I had thought that some word meaning 'in his sleep' must be found; for curiously

enough the best MSS give, for *τὸν Ὄσιριν, τὸν ἴριν*, which looks like a compromise between *τὸν Ὄσιριν* and an adscript *κατ' ὄνειρον*; but this is probably a mere fancy. A not very violent change would be *μεθύοντα*, which would accord with the anecdotic version of the myth here given.

Ch. 20, 359 A: *Θηβαίοις ἐοικότα.* Bouhier's *θηκαίοις* = sepulcris is certainly right: the word occurs frequently in this sense at Cos (see the index to my *Inscriptions of Cos*).

Ibid., 359 B: *μηθίδης φυτῷ περισκιαζόμενον*: Amyot read *μηδίφθης*. Parthey's correction *μυρίκης* is not mentioned by B. The evidence (given in Parthey's note: see Frazer *Golden Bough* I. p. 309) is sufficient to warrant its adoption. It is at least better than B.'s *μίνθης*.

Ch. 21, *ad init.*: *Εὔδοξος δὲ, πολλῶν τάφων ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ λεγομένων, ἐν Βουσίριδι τὸ σῶμα κεῖσθαι· καὶ γὰρ πατρίδα ταύτην γεγονέναι τοῦ Ὀσίριδος· οὐκέτι μέντοι λόγου δεῖσθαι τὴν Ταφόσιριν· αὐτὸ γὰρ φράζειν τοὔνομα ταφὴν Ὀσίριδος.* Is it possible that the last clause *οὐκέτι κτλ.* is part of the quotation from Eudoxus, who has just decided the claim in favour of Busiris? I think not. It seems to me absolutely necessary to transfer the clause to Plutarch, writing *οὐκέτι μέντοι λόγου δέοιτ' ἂν ἡ Ταφόσιρις* and *φράζει*.

Ch. 22, 359 D: *χρησαμένων τύχαις* is wrongly rendered in the translations (Amyot, Parthey, Dübner). It = *ἀποθανόντων* and no more.

Ibid., 359 E: *ὡς τῇ φύσει γεγονότας ἀνθρώπους*: read *ὡς τοιούτους τῇ φύσει γεγονότας*, cutting out *ἀνθρώπους*, which is superfluous, as *τῇ φύσει* means *τῇ τοῦ σώματος φύσει*.

Ibid. infra: *καὶ τὸ πλοῖον ὃ καλοῦσιν Ἕλληνες Ἀργώ, τῆς Ὀσίριδος νεὼς εἴδωλον ἐπὶ τιμῇ κατηστερισμένον οὐ μακρὰν φέρεσθαι τοῦ Ὠρίωνος κτλ.* As the sentence stands, *φέρεσθαι* depends on *ἱστοροῦσι*, and this cannot be right; for the position of the constellations was a matter of observation. The simplest correction is to insert *δοκεῖ δὲ* before *καὶ*.

Ch. 23, 360 A: *ἐξανθρωπίζοντας.* So B. (after Markland). It appears to me that the Vulgate *ἐξανθρωπίζοντι* is far better.

Ch. 24, 360 C: *ἀλλ' ὄνομα καὶ μνήμην βασιλέων ἀγαθῶν.* Perhaps the sentence is forcible enough as it stands, but after

ἀγαθῶν something such as οὐχ ὑπόληψιν θεῶν must be understood, and might plausibly be inserted.

Ch. 26, 361 B: δυσφημίας ἢ αἰσχρολογίαν. Amyot gives "ou il se fait ou dit quelque chose honteuse et vilaine." He therefore read αἰσχρουργίαν. Cp. *De Def. Or.* ch. 14.

Ibid., 361 C: ἄχρι οὗ κολασθέντες κτλ. This is practically part of the quotation: it is unnecessary for the argument. To give the end of a verse quotation in a prose paraphrase is a common trick of style. The actual lines of Empedocles probably began with εἰσόκε, and may have been nearer Virgil's "donec longa dies" etc. than we suspect.

Ch. 27, 361 D: ὑπολαβοῦσαν (ὑπολαβοῦσα MSS) can scarcely be right. A present participle, such as ὑποναρκοῦσαν? is required.

Ch. 29, 362 C: διὸ παντὸς ἠχοῦντος ἡμᾶς χαλκώματος ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι. This is quite simple and correct. Curiously enough, it has not been understood by the editors (Wyttenbach, Reiske, Parthey, Dübner), but Amyot translates rightly "c'est pourquoi nous mettons la main sur tout vase de bronze qui nous fait du bruit pour le faire cesser."

Ibid., 362 D: καὶ γὰρ Πλάτων τὸν Ἅιδην ὡς ἀδούσιον τοῖς παρ' αὐτῷ γενομένοις καὶ προσηνῆ θεὸν ὠνομάσθαι φησί: ἀδούσιον is B.'s conjecture for the Vulgate αἰδοῦς υἱόν. Plutarch is here referring to *Cratylus* (403–4). One thing is certain. Plato (*Cratylus* 404 A) concludes his discussion of the name Ἅιδης thus: καὶ τό γε ὄνομα ὁ Ἅιδης πολλοῦ δεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀειδοῦς ἐπωνομάσθαι, ἀλλὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ τοῦ πάντα τὰ καλὰ εἰδέναι, ἀπὸ τούτου ὑπὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου Ἅιδης ἐκλήθη. He has therefore been understood to derive Ἅιδης from *a* intensive and √*ἰδ*, in contrast to those who derive it from ἀειδής. Evidently Plutarch did not understand Plato so. How did he understand him and how shall we emend αἰδοῦς υἱόν? I think it is sufficiently obvious to anyone who reads carefully the passage in the *Cratylus*, that Plato is there deriving Ἅιδης from ἀεί and δεῖν "to bind." He alone can bind us for ever, because he binds us with the strongest chain, the hope of learning goodness—τῇ περὶ ἀρετὴν ἐπιθυμίᾳ. The meaning of the concluding words (which I quote above) is merely this, "And so

Hades is not so called from not knowing, but it is just because he knows everything that is good [and therefore can teach us, and *so bind us in eternal bonds*] that this name has been given him." I therefore think that *ἀειδέσμιον* should be restored to Plutarch's text.

Ch. 30, 362 E: *ἔτι δὲ καὶ ψυχορραγοῦσαν*: *καὶ* is not required. *Ibid.*, F: *καὶ προπηλακίζοντες*. Again cut out *καὶ* (with Reiske and Parthey).

Ch. 31, 363 C: *τῆς ὁμοιότητος*. Amyot, who translates "ce traitement," cannot have read *ὁμοιότητος*: perhaps he read *ὠμότητος*.

Ch. 34, 364 C: *περιπλεῖν*. *περιπολεῖν* should be certainly restored (with Salmasius).

Ch. 35, 364 E: *ἀρχικλὰ μὲν οὖσαν ἐν Δελφοῖς τῶν Θυιάδων*. Amyot read *ἐν Θήβαις* which is very possibly right. *ἀρχικλὰ* may represent *ἀρχιμαινάδα* written *ἀρχιμενάδα*, then *ἀρχιμάδα*, then corrupted to *ἀρχικάδα*; but this is scarcely probable.

Ibid., 364 F: *Σωκράτης ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ὁσίων*. There was an Argive Socrates who wrote a *περιήγησις Ἄργους*. There was also a Coan Socrates who wrote a work called *Θεῶν Ἐπικλήσεις* or simply *Ἐπικλήσεις*, from the sixth book of which Athenaeus quotes a statement about Dionysus. The work *περὶ Ὁσίων* is not elsewhere mentioned and the title is peculiar. I think that, although Plutarch is quoting Socrates for an Argive legend, it is the Coan whom he cites, and I should restore *ἐν ἕκτῳ Ἐπικλήσεων* here.

Ch. 36, 365 C: *καὶ γὰρ ὁ προστιθέμενος τῷ μύθῳ λόγος ὡς τοῦ Ὀσίριδος ὁ Τυφὼν τὸ αἰδοῖον ἔρριψεν εἰς τὸν ποταμόν, ἡ δ' Ἶσις οὐχ εὗρεν, ἀλλ' ἐμφερὲς ἄγαλμα θεμένη καὶ κατασκευάσασα τιμῆν καὶ φαλληφορεῖν ἔταξεν, ἐνταῦθα δὴ περιχωρεῖ, διδάσκων ὅτι τὸ γόνιμον καὶ τὸ σπερματικὸν τοῦ θεοῦ πρώτην ἔσχεν ὕλην τὴν ὑγρότητα, καὶ δι' ὑγρότητος ἀνεκράθη τοῖς πεφυκόσι μετέχειν γενέσεως*. The *θεμένη καὶ κατασκευάσασα* cannot possibly be right, and the context shows clearly that there is a lacuna. She must have made the image of wet clay and attached it to the body before it dried.

Ch. 37, 365 E: *Ἀρίστων ὁ γεγραφὼς Ἀθηναίων ἀποικίαν*. This, the reading of the MSS, should not be altered. This is

the only mention of the work, and, if it dealt with Athenian colonies in general, it would have been more extensively quoted.

Ch. 38, 366 A: Ἴσιδος σῶμα γῆν ἔχουσι καὶ νομίζουσιν is impossible. Perhaps εχογcικαι is a corruption of ἔσθ' ὅπου εἶναι: for σῶμα perhaps εἰκόνα: see note on ch. 39, 366 E.

Ibid., 366 C: τὸ παντελὲς τῆς γῆς ἄγονον, defended by B., will construe, but nevertheless makes nonsense. τὸ πρὸς ἀντολὰς is a tempting conjecture. In any case the Vulgate στερρότητος should stand: and εἶναι should be inserted after ἄγονον.

Ch. 39, 366 E. Substitute λέγοντες for λέγουσιν, and put a comma after χώρα. This is one way of making the passage readable.

Ch. 39, 366 E: βοῦν γὰρ Ἴσιδος εἰκόνα καὶ γῆν νομίζουσιν. It is useless to try to correct καὶ γῆν: immediately above (366 A) we have Ἴσιδος σῶμα γῆν νομίζουσιν. It is possible that someone who there read Ἴσιδος εἰκόνα (perhaps correctly) here added καὶ γῆν as a marginal comment. What is a βοῦς διάχρυσος? A βοῦς κατάχρυσος would be intelligible.

Ch. 40, 367 A: εἰ δὲ ταῦτα μὴ λέγεται παρὰ τὸ εἰκός. περιττῶς is perhaps a simpler correction of the Vulgate παρ' αὐτοῖς.

Ch. 40, 367 B: for ὅ δ' Ὧρος χρόνῳ, read, ὃν δ' Ὧρος χρόνον, i.e. "at the time when Horus."

Ch. 46, 369 E: πόαν γάρ τινα κόπτοντες Μῶλυ καλουμένην. The Vulgate is ὅμωμι. Is Μῶλυ given by some MS, or is it conjectured by Bernardakis? In either case it is sure to be wrong.

Ibid., 369 F: καὶ τῶν ζῴων ὥσπερ κύνας κτλ. If the order of the words is right, we require something (τὰ ἐγερτικά or τὰ φυλακτικά) before ὥσπερ: it is simpler to read ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ζῴων, with Wyttenbach.

Ch. 47, 370 B: διατρήσοντες τὸ ᾠὸν γαν**. B. gives a bad conjecture of his own here, and none of the better ones which have been made by previous critics. ἐνέβησαν, or ἐνῆκαν ἑαυτοὺς, gives the required sense, about which there can be no doubt.

Ibid., *infra*: Markland's ἀπολεῖσθαι for ἀπολείπεσθαι is certainly right. B. defends the Vulgate in his *Symb. Crit. in*

Plut., p. 73. He conjectures Ὡρομάζην for Ἄιδην, and renders ἀπολείπεσθαι "victorem remanere"—an impossible sense.

Ibid., 370 C: τὸν δὲ ταῦτα μηχανησάμενον θεὸν ἠρεμεῖν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθαι χρόνον, ἄλλως μὲν οὐ πολὺν ὡς θεῷ, ὥσπερ δ' ἀνθρώπῳ κοιμωμένῳ μέτριον. This is Reiske's restoration, adopted by B. The Vulgate is καλῶς μὲν οὐ πολὺν τῷ θεῷ ὥσπερ ἀνθρώπῳ κοιμωμένῳ μέτριον. I should suggest ἄλλως μὲν οὐ πολὺν ὡς θεῷ, τῷ δ' ἀνθρώπῳ κοιμωμένῳ μύριον.

Ch. 48, 370 C: put a comma after ποιουμένων, and read μυθολογούντων.

Ch. 49, 371 B: τὸ πολλάκις, the Vulgate, is right, or at least should not be corrected to τὴν πολλάκις.

Ch. 51, 371 F: the hawk λέγεται δὲ καὶ νεκρῶν ἀτάφων ὄμμασι γῆν ὑπερπετόμενος ἐπιβάλλειν. This, the Vulgate reading, is amply confirmed by the passage of Porphyry (*De Abst.* IV. 9) quoted by Wyttenbach.

Ibid., 372 A: πλημμελήσασα. Perhaps πλημμυρήσασα.

Ch. 52, 372 C: τὴν βοῦν ὑπὸ τροπὰς χειμερινὰς ἑπτάκις περὶ τὸν ναὸν περιφέρουσι. Bernardakis, in omitting ἑπτάκις, reproduces a typographical error of Dübner's text.

Ibid.: πάντων. Wyttenbach's conjecture Παχὼν should be mentioned.

Ch. 53, 372 F: for τὴν δ' ἐκ τοῦ κακοῦ, read τὴν δὲ τοῦ κακοῦ (with Markland).

Ibid.: αἷς χαίρει καὶ γέγηθε κυισκομένη καὶ ὑποπιμπλαμένη τῶν γενέσεων· εἰκὼν γάρ ἐστιν οὐσίας ἐν ὕλῃ γένεσις καὶ μίμημα τοῦ ὄντος τὸ γιγνόμενον. γένεσις is here (not always, cp. ch. 54, 373 C) the process, as distinguished from τὸ γιγν., the product of the process. Therefore I do not think that ὑποπιμπλαμένη τῶν γενέσεων can be right. I should suggest τῶν γνησίων or τέκνων γνησίων: cp. 375 A.

Ch. 54, 373 B: for γενομένη γένεσις read λεγομένη γένεσις. The somewhat difficult passage which follows is, I believe, rightly given by B. The context requires that (πρὶν) συντελεσθῆναι τῷ λόγῳ τὴν ὕλην should be rendered "before the λόγος and the ὕλη had grown to maturity together." Thus the verb is not used in its vulgar sense, but is equivalent to τελεσθῆναι σὺν.

Ch. 55, *ad init.* We should, I think, read *ὁ δ' Ὧρος ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος*, i.e. Horus proper, as distinguished from the *πρεσβύτερος Ὧρος*. One MS (F) gives *αὐτός ἐστιν οὕτως* for the Vulgate *οὗτος αὐτός*.

Ibid., 373 F: if the lacuna is after *κάλλιστον*, it is probably extensive, e.g. *τῶν τριγώνων τοῦ καλλίστου κατανενοηκέναι τὸ εὐάρμοστον*.

Ch. 58, 375 A: for *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* Böttcher[1] proposed *κἂν δικαίως συνῇ*, but this misses the point of the argument, which is that love is not incompatible with possession. Perhaps *ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἄνδρα νόμιμον καὶ δίκαιον ἐρᾶν <γυναικὸς κἂν> ἐν ἀδείᾳ συνῇ*.

Ch. 59, 375 A: *ὅπου δ' ὁ Τυφὼν παρεμπίπτει τῶν ἐσχάτων ἁπτομένῳ*. I should restore thus for *ἁπτόμενος*. There is an allusion here to a form of the myth according to which Osiris, while in the society of Nephthys, was surprised by Typhon. This part of the story was discarded by Plutarch in his narrative (chs. 12 f.), because it comprised repulsive details, but a comparison of chs. 14 and 38 shows that he supposed it to be known. *τὰ ἔσχατα* is the domain of Nephthys, or Nephthys herself: see ch. 38 and here below 375 B.

Ch. 64, 377 A: *διαποροῦντα πῶς οὔτε Δήμητρι τῆς τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἐπιμελείας μέτεστιν ἀλλ' Ἴσιδι, τόν τε Διόνυσον οὔτε τὸν Νεῖλον αὔξειν οὔτε τῶν τεθνηκότων ἄρχειν δυνάμενον*. Markland conjectured *διανοούμενον* for *δυνάμενον*, but we require a stronger word, such as *διαμαχόμενον*. For *οὔτε Δήμητρι* read *οὔ τι Δήμητρι*.

Ch. 66, 377 C: *Νεῖλον ἥν τε Νεῖλος ἄρδει μόνην χώραν*. Perhaps *ἀρδεύει*, as there is an echo of Aeschylus *Prom.* 852.

Ch. 66, 377 C: *μηδ' ἕλη μηδὲ λωτοὺς μὴ θεοποιΐαν λέγοντες*. We may be sure that salvation does not lie in altering *θεοποιΐαν* to some insignificant word. Perhaps *μόνον θεοποιεῖν*: i.e. "that marshes and lotus plants alone *produce gods*."

Ch. 67, 377 F: B. has here introduced into the text a very bad correction of his own. The MS reading *τοὺς χρωμένους*

[1] Bernardakis gives *ἂν δικαίως συνῇ* as *his own* emendation.

αὐτοὺς[1] *καὶ δωρουμένους ἡμῖν κτλ.* is sufficiently vindicated by ch. 1, 351 D *οἰκεῖα κεκτημένος ταῦτα καὶ χρώμενος.*

Ch. 69, 378 D: *καὶ παρ' Ἕλλησιν. καὶ γὰρ παρ'* is clearly required, notwithstanding the *καὶ γὰρ* in the next sentence. Perhaps we should there write *αἱ γὰρ Ἀθήνησι νηστεύουσι γυναῖκες.*

Ch. 70, 379 A: this passage is unintelligible as restored by B. The Vulgate requires but little change. *καθ' ἣν δ' ὥραν τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ δένδρων ἑώρων ἀφανιζομένους παντάπασιν καὶ ἀπολείποντας, οὓς δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ κατέσπειραν—ἔτι γλίσχρως καὶ ἀπόρως, διαμώμενοι τοῖς χερσὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ περιστέλλοντες αὖθις,—ἐπ' ἀδήλῳ τῷ πάλιν ἐκτελεῖσθαι καὶ συντέλειαν ἔξειν ἀποκειμένους κτλ.* I think the alteration of *ἀποθέμενοι* to *ἀποκειμένους* is necessary.

Ch. 71, 379 B: B.'s restoration *εὖ μὲν οὖν* for *οὐ μόνον* again ruins the sense. The Vulgate is *οὐ μόνον Ξενοφάνης ὁ Κολοφώνιος ἢ ἐξῆς οἱ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. οὐ μόνον* must be retained, as the *ἀλλ' ὅτι* below requires it. Perhaps *οὐ μόνον ὃ Ξενοφάνης ὁ Κ. ἤλεγξε, φησὶ γὰρ τοὺς Αἰγυπτιους κτλ.* or *οὐ μόνον ᾗ Ξ. ὁ Κ. ἤλεγξε ῥήσει τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, <κελεύων αὐτοὺς> κτλ.*

Ch. 72, 380 A: *αἴδιον αὐτοῖς ἐγκατασπεῖραι δείξαντα δεισιδαιμονίαν*: *δείξαντα* must be wrong: perhaps *δόξαν τε καὶ*. The whole of this passage reads like a quotation: the style is not Plutarch's.

Ch. 75, 381 B—C: *τοῦτο Νείλου πέρας ἐπίσταται τῆς αὐξήσεως γενόμενον. γενησόμενον* (Halm) is quite necessary, and *ἐπίσταται* should, perhaps, (with Reiske) be changed to *ἐπίστανται.*

Ch. 75, 381 F: *πλήθους ἀποφάσει καὶ δι' ἁπλότητα τῆς μονάδος.* The MSS have either *διπλοτάτοις* or *διπλοτάτης.* Amyot, who made a verse of this, and translates in verse accordingly, renders "la jeunesse en unité naive." I suppose that he read, or restored, *κἀπλότητι τῆς μονάδος*, and himself connected this with Apollo's youth.

Ch. 76, 382 A: all goes well as far as *ἀγαπητέον*, after which there should be a stop: then read *οὐκοῦν* and *τέχνημα*

[1] Thus given by B.: the Vulgate is *αὐτοῖς.*

δεῖ (not δεῖν as B. suggests). καλῶς, corrected by Bentley to καὶ ὅλως, looks suspiciously like an adscript.

Ch. 79, 383 B: we should write μάλιστα δὲ ταῖς ἱερουργίαις ...οὐχ ἧττον ἔνεστι (with Wyttenbach).

Ch. 80, 384 B: τῷ δὲ κῦφι χρῶνται καὶ πόματι καὶ κράματι. Read χρίματι, and, after the lacuna, for χρὴ μαλακτικόν, χρῖμα μαλακτικόν.

W. R. PATON.

Actus in the sense of an action or achievement ("Contributions to Latin Lexicography" p. 32). Add Valerius Flaccus 4 163 *nec vestros comes aspernandus in actus;* where Friesemann has unnecessarily conjectured *ausus*. Statius has several instances; 3 Silv. 3 76 *praecipuos...in actus:* see also 4 Silv. 4 38, 72, Achill. 1 578.

Adolere, to make fragrant: Statius 2 Silv. 4 34 *Assyrio cineres adolentur amomo.*

Ambiguosus: add this word to the lexicons from Nonius p. 27 M, where the manuscripts on the whole confirm it.

Civitas in the general sense of society. Add Cicero Cael. § 38 *in tam maledica civitate:* Seneca Epist. 114 11 *quomodo conviviorum luxuria, quomodo vestium, aegrae civitatis indicia sunt.*

Condĭtio (from *condere*) in the sense of storing up. Cic. Div. 1 § 116 *nec fruges terrae bacasve arborum cum utilitate ulla generi humano dedisset (natura divina), nisi earum cultus et conditiones tradidisset.* This passage is wrongly quoted under *condicio* by Lewis and Short.

Conduro (to harden). Add to the instance from Lucretius quoted in the lexicons, Servius G. 4 37 *mella...frigore condurata.*

Ductus of the outlines of a figure in painting or sculpture, Statius 4 Silv. 6 23 *artificum veteres agnoscere ductus.*

Effero = to turn into a wild animal. Add to the instances in Georges, Scholia to Germanicus's Aratea pp. 381, 382 Eyssenhardt.

Experientia. Add to the instances quoted in the lexicons and in "Contributions etc." p. 451 Statius Theb. 6 775 *is vigor ingenio, tanta experientia dextrae est* (said of a boxer): 4 Silv. 6

44 *quis modus in dextra, quanta experientia docti Artificis curis* (of an artist).

Genius of life, vital force; add to the lexicons Statius 1 Silv. 1 58 (of the equestrian statue) *nec ferro aut aere laborat, Sed genio:* 4 6 19 (of living influence) *nox...memoranda diu geniumque habitura perennem.*

Immorior. Add to the lexicons Valerius Flaccus 4 182 *bracchia rapta viris, strictoque immortua caestu.*

Importunitas in the sense of unseasonableness; Porphyrion on Hor. 1 Epist. 18 40 (*nec cum venari volet ille poemata panges*): *importunitas voluntatis odiosum facit.*

Longinquus in the sense of *longus.* The lexicons do not state clearly enough that this use of *longinquus* is confined to time, action, or condition, and is never apparently extended to the meaning of physical length; that *longinquum tempus,* for instance, may stand for *longum tempus,* but not *longinqua mensa* for *longa mensa.* Plautus Mercator 610 R *longinquom loqui;* Miles Gloriosus 731 R *vitam ei longinquam darent;* Bacchides 1194 R *tam pol quidem id quidem* (the enjoyment) *esse haud perlonginquom;* Ennius Ann. 401 *postremae longinqua dies confecerat aetas;* Lucilius 30 54 Müller, *bene longincum mortalibus morbum In vino esse, ubi qui invitavit dapsilius se;* Cic. Div. 1 § 109 *longinqua observatio;* 2 § 20 *quam longinquo tempore observari potest?* Fin. 2 § 94 *longinquus dolor* and *longinqui dolores;* 3 § 46 *nec longinquiora brevioribus* (of states or conditions); Caes. G. 1 47 *longinqua consuetudine;* 5 29 *longinqua obsidione;* so C. 3 80; Tacitus A. 3 24 *peregrinatio longinqua;* 14 24, 15 8 *longinqua itinera.*

But in Livy 4 18 2 the context shows that *longinqua militia* does not mean long service, but service far from home; so Tacitus A. 11 10 *Parthi...longinquam militiam aspernabantur.*

Longinquus means far-fetched in Fronto ad Verum 1 p. 114 Naber, *Sisenna* (*scripsit historiam*) *longinque.*

Manifestare. Add to the lexicons Nonius p. 24, *fidei proprietatem manifestavit M. Tullius;* p. 25 *seditionis proprietas a M. Tullio manifestata est.*

Mediastrinus or *mediastinus.* The different ways in which this word is spelt may suggest that it was to some extent

misunderstood in antiquity. The two chief forms are *mediastinus* and *mediastrinus* (see "Contributions etc." p. 524). There are, however, other and minor variations; Gloss. Philox. p. 128 23 G give (perhaps by a mere mistake) *mediestrinus*: again, a form *mediestinus* is preserved by several good MSS. of Priscian 1 p. 80. The St Gallen glossary (p. 258 Goetz) has both *mediastinus* and *mediastinus*; the MSS. *a* and *b* adding to the interpretation *balneator* the following words; *nam prius mediastinus dictus quasi in media ustione positus.* Porphyrion on Horace 1 Epist. 14 14 interprets the word *incola mediae civitatis an in officio balneatoris mediastinus.* I still believe that the proper form was *mediastrinus*, perhaps from a lost form *mediaster*: and that the form *mediastinus* arose from a fancied etymology from *medius* and ἄστυ; and that *mediastinus* and *mediestinus* may have grown out of a notion that the word came from *media ustio, medius aestus.*

Mirari in the sense of *imitari*, to make a person one's pattern or standard. Verg. A. 8 517 *primis et te miretur ab annis*, where Servius says *miretur imitetur*, and quotes Lucan 9 807 *miratoremque Catonis.* These passages make me inclined to think that *mirentur* (the reading of the Dantzig MS.) should be retained in Cicero Acad. Post. 1 § 10 *quanto magis philosophi delectabunt, si, ut illi Aeschylum Sophoclen Euripiden, sic hi Platonem mirentur, Aristotelen, Theophrastum*; where *imitentur*, which Mr Reid adopts from the other MSS., looks like a gloss. Compare also Cicero Orator § 23 *itaque nobis monendi sunt ii quorum sermo imperitus increbruit, qui aut dici se desiderant Atticos aut ipsi Attice volunt dicere, ut mirentur hunc maxime, quo ne Athenas quidem ipsas magis credo fuisse Atticas;* Statius 5 Silv. 2 76 *mirarique patrem miseraeque ignoscere matri.*

Nectere moras. The lexicons illustrate this phrase from Tacitus only: it is also to be found in Seneca De Ira 3 39 3, and Statius Theb. 3 495, 4 677.

Nedum. Lewis and Short explain this word as meaning 'while not,' Georges as = *ne dum*, 'not to grant or allow.' Neither explanation seems to me to correspond adequately with the usages of *nedum*; which I am inclined to regard as no more than an emphatic negative, the last syllable *dum*

having as much or as little meaning as in *agedum*, or *pulta dum fores* in Plautus. This will appear more probable if we remember that *ne* alone sometimes has the force of *nedum*. In Sallust (Bellum Catilinae 11 8) P^2 has *ne illi...corruptis moribus victoriae temperarent* (much less was it likely that they would moderate their passions in the hour of victory); and so the passage is quoted by Priscian 2 p. 100 K. P^3 however, and Priscian in another place (2 p. 503), cite it with *nedum*. Cicero De Domo § 139 *tamen in scelere religio non valeret; ne valeat id quod imperitus adulescens* etc. I admit that C. F. W. Müller reads *nunc valeat id?* but *ne = nedum* makes very good sense; 'surely that ought to have no weight.' Cicero ad Fam. 9 26 2 *nihil istorum ne iuvenem quidem movit...ne nunc senem;* Tacitus Ann. 11 30 according to the Medicean; *nec nunc adulterium obiecturum; ne domum...reposceret.*

In these cases I suppose the subjunctive clause with *ne* to be syntactically a final clause, in which the meaning is expressed elliptically; 'none of these things moved me even 'in my youth (I say this to prevent your thinking) that they 'will influence me in my old age.' The impossibility of the idea is represented as an impossibility of the fact.

Nedum with the subjunctive, to which I will now call attention, has exactly the same meaning. Terence Heautont. 452 *satrapa si siet Amator, nunquam sufferre eius sumptus queat; Nedum tu possis;* Cicero Cluent. § 95 *nec M. Popilius nec M. Metellus...vim tribuniciam sustinere potuerunt; nedum his temporibus...salvi esse possint;* Planc. § 90 *ego ne immortalitatem quidem...accipiendam putarem, nedum emori vellem;* ad Fam. 16 8 2 *vix in ipsis lectis frigus vitatur...nedum in mari...sit facile abesse ab iniuria temporis;* Inv. 1 § 70 *nec...Epaminondae permitteremus...ut...interpretaretur; nedum nunc istum patiamur ...scriptoris voluntatem interpretari;* De Lege Agr. 2 § 97 *homo privatus...vix continetur; nedum illi...non statum conquisituri sint;* Hor. A. P. 69 *mortalia facta peribunt: Nedum sermonum stet honos et gratia vivax;* Livy 26 26 11 *nedum in bello respirare civitatem forent passuri;* and so often Tacitus, e.g. H. 2 38 *nedum posituri bellum fuerint;* Ann. 14 15 *nedum...quicquam probi moris reservaretur.*

A curious piece of surplusage is the expression *nedum ut*, for *nedum*, with the subjunctive. Livy 3 14 6 *ne voce quidem incommodi, nedum ut ulla vis fieret;* Quintilian 12 1 39 *nedum, si ab homine occidendo grassator avertendus sit...ut hoc...sit alias in ipso sapiente laudandum;* Tacitus Dialogus 10 *quando recitationum fama in totam urbem penetrat? nedum ut per tot provincias innotescat.*

The use of *nedum* without a subjunctive verb seems not to be older than the Ciceronian age, and is, I suspect, to be explained by supposing an ellipse of the subjunctive clause. Cicero ad Fam. 7 28 1 *erat enim multo domicilium huius urbis ...aptius humanitati et suavitati tuae quam tota Peloponnesus, nedum Patrae* (i.e. *tam aptae essent*). Balbus and Oppius to Cicero (ad Atticum 9 7 A 1) *nedum hominum humilium, ut nos sumus, sed etiam amplissimorum virorum consilia ex eventu probari solent;* the classical form of which would have been *etiam amplissimorum virorum consilia ex eventu probari solent; nedum humilium hominum non ex eventu probentur.* Livy 6 7 2 *aegre inermem multitudinem, nedum armatam, sustineri posse* (= *nedum armata sustineri posset*). So Livy 7 40 3 *quem armorum etiam pro patria satietas teneret, nedum adversus patriam* (*non teneret*); 9 18 4 *etiam victis Macedonibus graves, nedum victoribus;* 24 4 1 *vixdum libertatem, nedum dominationem;* Seneca Epist. 99 3 *satis videbare habere animi etiam adversus solida mala, nedum ad istas umbras malorum;* Tacitus H. 5 5 *nulla simulacra urbibus, nedum templis;* Dial. 25 *etiam isdem saeculis, nedum diversis.*

Nemus in the sense of a tree; Isidore Orig. 17 17 6 *sunt autem nemora arbores maiores.* Perhaps in Vergil G. 2 15 *nemorumque Iovi quae maxima floret Aesculus;* Statius 5 Silv. 1 49 (*vitem*) *Ulmus amat, miscetque nemus.*

Nenia soricina. Plautus Bacchides 888 R *Qua quidem te faciam, si tu me irritaveris, Confossiorem soricina nenia.* Weise's note on this passage gives, I think, the right clue to the meaning. After translating *soricina nenia* as = *cadaver soricis* (surely an impossible interpretation) he says *quamquam Arnobio adversus Gentes lib.* VII. *videtur apparere, neniam vocatam esse genus quoddam farciminis.* The passages in Arnobius are 7 24,

25, where he is speaking of various parts of the intestines: *quid taedae, quid neniae, quid offae non vulgi sed quibus est nomen appellatioque penitue? Ex quibus quod primum est* (i.e. *taeda*), *in exiguas arvina est miculas catillaminum insecta de more, quod in secundo situm est* (i.e. *nenia*), *intestini est perrectio, per quam proluvies editur sucis perexsiccata vitalibus.* 25 *O deorum magnitudo mirabilis...siquidem...*[*non*] *prius iras atque animos ponunt nisi sibi adoleri paratas conspexerint nenias, offasque reddier penitas.* Compare this with the note of Paulus p. 163 M, *quidam aiunt neniae ductum nomen ab extremi intestini vocabulo, Graeci enim νέατον extremum dicunt.* The fragment of the fuller note in Festus (p. 161) clearly shows that this meaning of *nenia* was illustrated by the very passage in the Bacchides which has been quoted above; *...nio utitur Plautus ...chedem ad...te reddam u...rem soricina...* The meaning then of *confossiorem soricina nenia* would literally be "made more mincemeat of than the intestines of the field-mouse;" "chopped up into sausages like a field-mouse's intestines."

Oblaqueare. In my "Contributions" p. 6 I have adduced some evidence to show that *oblaqueo* (or rather *oblacuo*) is the right form, not *ablaqueo.* I should have added that the form *oblaqueo* has, according to Schneider, good manuscript support in Columella de Arboribus 5 §§ 3, 4, 5; 6 § 4, 5.

Per = *ἀνά* in a distributive sense: Palladius 4 8 1 *binas per maiorem arborem quallos;* and elsewhere in Palladius.

Praecipio in the sense of to choose out first, corresponding to the use of *praecipuus;* Valerius Flaccus 4 341 *exortia terga Laconi Praecipiunt pecudum.*

Quaesitor in the sense of a seeker: add to the instances in Georges Nonius p. 22 *canes ferarum vel animalium quaesitores.*

Subicio in the sense of to throw upwards. Add to the instances in Georges, Cicero In Toga Candida p. 85 Orelli, *te...e postremo in tertium locum esse subiectum.*

Titania astra (Aen. 6 724). Perhaps the right explanation of this expression is given in the Glossae Vergilianae edited by Goetz (p. 467 3) *Titania astra micantia* (or *micantia*) *ab Astrio Titane ordinata. Astrio* of course stands for *As-*

traeo, and *Titania* will thus mean 'set in their places by Astraeus.'

Vespero-onis, one who works in the evening: Servius Aen. 11 143 *inde etiam qui funeri praeerant a vespera primum vesperones, deinde vespillones dicti videntur.*

H. NETTLESHIP.

TONITRALIS IN LUCRETIUS 2 1105.

Caeli tonitralia templa of the MSS. has been altered by the editors to *caeli penetralia templa*. I suggested in my "Contributions" p. 600 that *tonitralia* might be right, "being derived from a lost form *tonitrum* in the second declension." I should have added that Priscian 1 p. 210 Keil says of the words *cornu*, *genu*, and *tonitru*, that they were declined by the *antiquissimi* as *cornum*, *genum*, and *tonitrum*. The form *tonitrum* is also mentioned in a list of second-declension neuters by Asper in Hagen's *Anecdota Helvetica* p. 41 26.

H. NETTLESHIP.

NOTE ON HOM. OD. BK. 17, L. 486.

This passage is read as follows in our books:

> Καί τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσιν,
> παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας
> ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίαν ἐφορῶντες.

It appears that Philo Iudaeus read the last two lines thus:

> παντοῖοί τε λαθόντες, ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας
> ἀνθρώπων ὕβρεις τε καὶ εὐνομίας ἐφορῶντες.

The reading παντοῖοί τε λαθόντες, "*lurking under all sorts of forms*," seems to have more point than τελέθοντες. The lines are cited in Philo's Quaestiones in Genesin, p. 245 of Aucher's Edition. These Quaestiones are only preserved in the old Armenian version of about the year 400 A.D. The Armenian is correctly rendered by Aucher "sub omni specie ignoti" and can hardly represent any other reading of the original Greek than that above conjectured.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

THE VATICAN GLOSSARY No. 3321.

(*Journal of Philology* no. 39 p. 49 foll.)

I WISH at once to acknowledge my great obligation to Mr Housman for his criticisms on my conjectures. In several cases he is, in my opinion, certainly right. 21 8 *larvas demonas* is much better than *heroas*, and is confirmed by Gloss. Latino-Graec. p. 121 19 *larva δαιμόνιον, εἴδωλον*. The same must be said of *aphaeretice* for *aufertice* (22 22): *dedecoratio* for *decoratio* (53 12), *evitat* for *evirat* (65 50): *phoenicium* for *fenium* (75 54): *genesis, fons* for *gener, foris* (82 19): *libanus* for *licanus* (108 32), *pavitans* for *papitans* (136 26).

I feel less certainty with regard to Mr Housman's corrections in the case of *prospero* (4 44), *eligit* (61 35), *aflecavit* (68 44) and several others which it is hardly necessary at present to discuss at length.

There are a few instances in which I am unable to agree with Mr Housman. In 51 2 I think his change of *depopulatio* to *depalatio* both violent and unnecessary. I still believe that *depopulatio dissignatio* is right, *dissignatio* meaning the uprooting of landmarks. I am much inclined to suspect that Vergil wrote *ingentes et dissignavimus agros* in Aen. 11 367 (where P gives *designavimus*), meaning 'we have torn up the landmarks over wide regions.'

62 24 I am not sure that there is any necessity for altering *emptorium* to *emporium*. Albinus p. 300 K has (according to the MSS.) *emptorium sine h, latine mercatus*. Comparing Beda p. 271 Keil, *emporia feminino genere et est* (? *est et*) *graecum, latine mercatus*, I am inclined to think that Albinus must have written *emporia sine h, latine mercatus*, and have then added a note on *emptorium*.

It must be remembered that, in dealing with this glossary, we are dealing with a really valuable ancient lexicon, which, as every one who studies it carefully must see, preserves a number of words which, in the fragmentary state of the existing Latin literature, have not otherwise survived. No one who has given much attention to Latin lexicography will feel sensitive about adding to 'the lexicons,' that is, to the current modern handbooks, new words and new meanings if they are sufficiently attested. In 68 46, for instance, I think that *exerta* might fairly be glossed by *elevata*, 'lifted out, thrust out.' Comp. 67 53 *exerta exporrecta, elevata.* So in 75 21 *feminales panni* may easily be right, although 'the lexicons' only know of *feminalia.* In 86 48 *silvisatus* is quite in the style of the compounds which are so frequent in old Latin poetry, while *silvaticus* is common.

In 94 26 I do not see why *inedia* should not sometimes have meant 'inability to eat,' and *stupor* 'palsy,' just as Cicero (In Pis. § 1) speaks of *stupor linguæ.* Compare Hessels' Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary I 270 *inedia, stupore dentium.* In 113 17 (*manda deceptio vel fraus*) I should perhaps have suggested *mendum*, not *menda*, as Charisius p. 72 says *mendum* was used for *mendacium*, not *menda.* But again, one cannot be sure that this is not one of the artificial *differentiæ* forced upon their language by the Latin grammarians. It is clear that *mendax* postulates a substantive *menda* or *mendum. Menda* is supported by Albinus p. 305 5 Keil, *menda deceptio vel fraus, inde mendax et inde mendacium.*

In 118 41 why not admit *modestare* = σωφρονίζειν? In an uncial MS. *st* and *r* are not so easily confused.

In 143 23 I cannot agree with Mr Housman that *pix tracxit* = *piscatrix.* The fish called *piscatrix* would more naturally have been defined *rana marina:* while Glossae *Affatim* p. 553 41 and Hessels' Glossary P 402 give *pistrix belua marina.* So Servius Aen. 3 427 says, of the word *pistrix, si de 'belua' dicitur.*

H. NETTLESHIP.

NOTES ON THE VATICAN GLOSSARY 3321.

(*Concluded.*)

P. 181 15 Goetz. *Thalastrum colofus in talo. Talatrus* is the form given in *Glossae Nominum*, p. 171, where see Löwe; *talaxtrix* on this page l. 35 is no doubt for *talastrus*.

181 20 *Tames cruor sanguinis.* Read *tabes.*

181 31 *Tabo sanguine corruptum id est sanies.* Read *corrupto...sanie.*

181 34 *Talio eisdem vel praesentem.* Read, from Glossae *Abavus* p. 396 1 of this volume, *talio, eiusdem rei repensatio.*

181 38 *Tarea vestis regia aut toga purpurea.* Read *trabea* (Isidore Orig. 19 18 8).

181 41 *Tantare ācarmen tricerberum, id est tricipitem.* Read (from *a*) and *Glossae Vergilianae* p. 466 9 *Tartareum custodem, canem tricerberum*, etc. For *tricerberus* see Georges, to whose instances should be added Servius Aen. 1 133, *tricerberum fulmen.*

182 2 *Talius morbus.* Perhaps for *tabes.*

182 14 *Teloneum quasi omnium litorum fiscalis conductio tenere conductio.* There seems to be a confusion between *teloneum* and *telonea.* The interpretation of *teloneum* is apparently lost, while *tenere* may stand for *telonea.* Is *litorum* sound, or does it stand for [*pub*]*licorum*?

182 30 *Tetrum pugeum vel orribilem.* For *pugeum, putidum* may be right; or perhaps *putrem.*

182 36 *Terti rotundi.* Read *teretes.*

182 47 *Tentus usque aliter fines.* Probably for *tenus* (so *a*) *usque; aliter finis.*

183 3 *Temnum frandem.* Read *techinam* (*a* has *tehinan*).

183 4 *Tenebris confusus ubi impiorum anime retruduntur.* This gloss is probably to be supplemented by the words *Tartarus, locus inferni gelidissimus* (p. 181 32). For the cold of Tartarus see Servius Aen. 6 577. *Retruduntur* perhaps stands for *detruduntur.*

183 7 *Tegitilla tectorium intus tectum.* If *tegitilla,* diminutive of *teges,* be sound, the word should be added to the lexicons.

183 12 *Tenilis qui teneri potest.* Perhaps for *tenibilis.*

183 17 *Terminati exolati.* This use of *terminare* should be recorded in the lexicons.

183 27 *Tesserarius praepositus currorum.* Perhaps *currorum* stands for *cuborum.*

183 28 *Thema auster.* Perhaps *astrum.*

183 44 *Tergus persecutio.* Probably *tergus* (or *tergum*) *pro scuto;* see Servius Aen. 9 412, who illustrates the use of *tergum* for a shield.

184 12 *Tetrimentum nutrimentum. Tetrimentum* (? *taetramentum*) seems to be derived from a lost *taetrare* or *taetrere,* and to mean a foul thing; comp. *atramentum, sacramentum* from *atrare, sacrare.* For *nutrimentum* we should probably write *putrimentum,* from Glossae *Affatim* p. 574 1.

184 16 *Tiasis laudes virginum.* So also Glossae *Abavus* p. 397 12. *Laudes* may perhaps stand for *coetus;* so the Berne Scholia on Ecl. 5 30, *thiasi coetus virginum;* or for *choreae;* Servius on the same passage, *thiasi sunt choreae Liberi.*

184 29 *Tirias arces carta dicicatoris dicta.* Perhaps *Tyrias arces, Cartaginem, a Tyriis dictas.*

185 7 *Tolor asta.* Perhaps for *telorum, hastarum.*

185 13 *Torpor frigdorum stupor animi vel corporis.* Probably *torpor frigdor* (so *a*) *i.e. stupor* etc. Glossae *Abavus* p. 398 50 *turpor frigdor.*

185 23 *Torridis extuosis.* Read *aestuosis.*

185 24 *Tos tantos.* Perhaps *tot,* according to the late Latin use of *tantus:* l. 37 below *tot tantus* (= *tantos*).

185 28 *Torretur uffetur vel siccatur.* Read *uritur.*

185 30 *Toracas loricas vel pectorales.* Remove *vel.*

185 33 *Togax furunculus.* Read *tagax.*

185 36 *Tonsa pectora acervos animos.* Probably for *obtunsa pectora, acerbos animos:* Servius Aen. 1 567 *obtusa (pectora) stulta, id est crudelia.*

185 44 *Tolleno quod alternis adtollitur, vel quod tollat autum aquam. Autum* (*a* has *austum*) perhaps stands for *austrum* or *haustrum;* so that the right reading may be *tolleno haustrum quod* etc., *vel quod tollat aquam.* Or again *autum* may represent *haustam,* agreeing with *aquam.*

186 20 *Trusus inclusus.* Read *inpulsus.*

186 27 *Tritile quod teri potest.* Add *tritilis* to the lexicons.

187 3 *Tronat transvolat.* Read *tranat.*

187 9 *Trous rote genus ad lusum.* Read *trochus.*

187 17 *Truncone deforature.* Perhaps *trunco ore, deformato ore.* Or *truncatione, deformatura.*

187 25 *Tunsa pectora aut verberata.* Remove *aut,* and read *tunsae pectora, verberatae.* Aen. 1 481 *tunsae pectora palmis.*

187 33 *Turpis culum.* Read *turpisculum* [*deminutivum a turpis*]: so Gloss. Anglo-Sax. ed. Hessels T. 386.

187 39 *Turam naturam.* Perhaps *toreuma, tornaturam:* Glossae *Affatim,* p. 575 25 *toregma turnatura.*

187 52 *Tuore, visu.* Add this instance of *tuor* to the one given by Georges.

188 7 *Tuturilla locus in quo corruptelae fiebant quod ibi turturi opera dabatur id est pane.* In Arnobius 4 6 a god *Tutunus* is mentioned, the equivalent of Priapus. Should *Tuturilla* then be written *tutunilla,* and *turturi tutuno?* In any case *pane* probably stands for *peni.*

188 14 *Varba callidus vel artificiosus.* Read *vafra, callida v. artificiosa.*

188 22 *Vagus exerrant.* Read *exerrans,* from p. 189 1.

188 34 *Valitant valent vel sani sunt.* Gloss. Sang. p. 294 36 gives *validant.*

188 36 *Vabis valde afrum est.* Read *vafrum:* Nonius p. 19 *vafrum est valde Afrum.*

188 37 *Valgis fures versus tumentibus.* Probably for *valgi, suris diversis, tumentibus:* Festus 375 *valgi qui diversas suras*

habent: Novius ap. Non. p. 25 *valgus, genibus magnis, talis turgidis.* See, however, Löwe, Prodromus, p. 268 foll.

188 42 *Vaccillat qui non firmis nec stabilitis vestigiis gradiens uaculo induens.* Perhaps *baculo inclinat se.*

189 5 *Valus qui genibus iunctis ambulat.* Read *vatius.*

189 39 *Vellere edificare.* Probably for *eradicare:* so Gloss. Sang. p. 294 54.

189 45—48 *Venalicium quidquid vendi potest venundare uterator. Venundare vendere. Veterator strofas artes.* The words *venundare uterator* (= *veterator*) are only repetitions from the following glosses. For *strofas artes* comp. Glossae *Affatim* p. 578 30 *strofosus astutus,* which may be right.

189 53 *Vestias quasi nomen ignis que celebrabantur roma.* Perhaps [*Vesta est ἀπὸ τῆς*] *ἑστίας, q. n. i., quae celebrabatur Romae:* see Servius Aen. 1 292. The gloss is repeated in a more corrupt form p. 191 30 below.

190 4 *Verant deputent diu hoc egent.* Read *versant disputant, diu hoc agunt.*

190 21 *Vertibola cardines.* Add this instance of *vertibulum* to those in Georges.

190 24 *Verbigeratione sermocinatione.* Add the word *verbigeratio* to the lexicons.

190 42 *Vernus subaudis vel dies.* The *vel* should be omitted.

191 6 *Venuste pulchre iocunde oruane.* For *oruane* read *urbane.*

191 20 *Verberans sedens.* Read *caedens.*

191 24 *Vexillum adventum dictum portatorium.* Perhaps *adventum* represents *a vehendo.* Add *portatorium* to the lexicons.

191 43 *Vena nocte exiit.* Perhaps a corruption of the gloss in Glossae *Affatim* p. 578 32 *vespero* (= *vesperugo;* Paulus p. 368) *stella quae initio noctis exit.*

191 45 *Vespero stella quae initio noctis excitat.* Read *vesperugo...excitatur.*

191 46 *Vendit distractus est.* Read *veniit.*

192 1 *Verbibus virgulis ferreis.* Perhaps for two glosses: *verberibus virgulis:* [*veribus telis*] *ferreis.* At l. 20 below

occurs the gloss *viribus tellis ferens virgulis*, repeated in *Glossae Vergilianae* p. 468 46. The first part of this probably stands for *veribus, telis ferreis:* the word *virgulis* seems to require some other word as its *lemma*, and I would suggest that the word is *verberibus.*

192 19 *Vivix pugna.* Read *vibix plaga:* p. 193 1 *vibix plaga ex virga:* Glossae *Affatim* p. 579 31 *vibex paga ex virga. Plaga* was corrupted to *paga*, and this again altered to *pugna.*

192 21 *Vibifices cese plagarum.* Read *vibices cestigia plagarum:* p. 194 7.

192 26 *Vicorum et cistifer nomina sunt metallorum.* Perhaps *victoriatus et cistophorus.*

192 29 *Vintere alligare.* Read *vincire.*

192 32 *Vibra crepando.* Probably *vibrando.*

192 33 *Virtuncula virgo diminu.* Read *virguncula virgo deminutive.* (Gloss. *Affatim* p. 579 35.)

192 37 *Vigavisae subterfugisse. Vices vicissitudines.* Read *vitavisse vices, subterfugisse vicissitudines.* (Aen. 2 433.)

192 40 *Visum est superius displicuit.* Read *visum est superis, dis placuit.* (Aen. 3 1.)

192 45 *Vis violentia id est qui circumfusa cordis animam continetur.* Read *Vis violentia.* [*Viscera vitalia*], *id est* [*loca*] *quae circumfusa* [*sunt*] *cordi* (?) [*quibus*] *anima continetur.* Isidore Orig. 11 1 116 *viscera vitalia, id est circumfusa loca cordis* (? *cordi*), *quasi viscora, eo quod ibi vita, id est anima, continetur.* See also p. 194 4.

193 7 *Vialiter virtutem violentialiter multitudine vel habundantiam.* Perhaps *vim, aliter virtutem,* [*aliter*] *violentiam, aliter multitudinem vel abundantiam.*

193 18 *Vicet cremat vel torquet.* Read *urit, cremat torret:* p. 195 13.

193 27 *Virissat viriliter sapit.* Add *virisso* to the lexicons.

193 36 *Virops que iam virum opus habet.* Read *virosa.*

193 38 *Viodent culpe deputent.* Read *vitio dent.*

194 10 *Vintis catenis.* Read *vinclis.*

194 17 *Vividus udus.* Read *uvidus.*

194 25 *Ultroirae vindicare vel ulcisci.* Read *ulciscere* (l. 47 below).

195 13 *Ulci aliqui.* Read *ulli.*

195 27 *Vosat vivit.* Read *vorat bibit.*

195 33 *Volupes voluptuosus est.* Read *volup est, voluptuosum est.*

195 35 *Volant dividunt.* Perhaps *volunt, desiderant.*

196 3 *Urus circuitus civitatis.* Read *urvus,* or *urvum.*

196 5 *Urna mensura unde ducuntur sortes quasi quartarium est.* Read *urna unde ducuntur sortes: mensura quasi quartarius est.*

196 6 *Urias lux media.* Perhaps *urias* represents *meridies.*

196 13 *Usitat conburit.* The spelling of *a, ussitat,* is probably right. The word *ussito* should be added to the lexicons.

196 51 *Vulnificat vulnera facit.* Add *vulnifico* to the lexicons.

197 5 *Ulnae brachia vel inferi.* Probably *ulnae bracchia; umbrae inferi.*

197 8 *Xenodium ospitium,* etc. Read *xenodochium.*

197 10 *Xila grece latine lingua.* Read *ligna.*

197 35 *Zerne impetudines ex fiegmate falso.* Read *sarnae impetigines.* Isidore Orig. 4 8 66 says that *sarna* was a popular word for *impetigo.*

H. NETTLESHIP.

A NOTE ON CAESAR'S INVASIONS OF BRITAIN.

In number 34 of the Journal of Philology an article on this subject appeared by Mr Malden; it was followed in number 37 by a reply from Professor Ridgeway, to be succeeded in number 38 by a second article from each of the two disputants. I hope I may be allowed in this number[1] to indicate a few points in which I dissent from some of the arguments employed and to bring forward one or two sources of evidence which seem to have been overlooked.

The subject in dispute naturally falls into two parts, A the starting-place, B the landing-place. These two parts are of course to a certain extent interdependent.

A. Under the head of A Mr Ridgeway argues (i) that the τὸ Ἴτιον of Strabo is the same as the τὸ Ἴτιον ἄκρον of Ptolemy and therefore denotes a headland: (ii) that the *portus Itius* was not necessarily a port at all, but probably merely a roadstead near the headland, being termed by Strabo ναύσταθμον: (iii) that the Ἴτιον ἄκρον must be Cape Grisnez: (iv) that Caesar started from the same place on both expeditions.

(i) The first point does not seem to be of great importance: it is reasonable to suppose that the Itian headland and the Itian port were close together, and we may fairly concede that when Strabo wrote the words τὸ Ἴτιον he was thinking of a promontory and not of a port. (ii) On the view that Caesar's *portus Itius* was not a port at all but merely a roadstead, we may remark, firstly, that as Caesar calls it a port it probably

[1] I may state that my paper was written before the appearance of number 38. I have now made sundry additions to it, and have struck out or modified parts that seemed no longer relevant.

was a port in the ordinary meaning of the term; secondly, that no particular weight need be attached to Strabo's statement, for he had no personal knowledge of Gaul and, as we shall see below, his information about the geography of this region was extremely confused; thirdly, that Caesar would never have chosen a more or less exposed roadstead for the assembling and equipment of a large fleet if he could possibly have avoided it[1]. (iii) Mr Ridgeway assumes as a matter of course that Ptolemy's Ἴτιον ἄκρον was Cape Grisnez, because Grisnez is usually regarded as the chief headland on this coast. It may be as well to give Ptolemy's exact words which he has omitted to quote.—

μετὰ τὰς τοῦ Σηκοάνα ποταμοῦ ἐκβολὰς	
Φρούδιος ποταμοῦ ἐκβολαί	κα′ L″δ″, νβ γ″
Ἴτιον ἄκρον	κβ′ δ″, νγ′ L″
Γησοριακὸν ἐπίνειον Μορινῶν	κβ′ L″, νγ′ L″

He thus places his Itian headland on the same parallel of latitude as Gesoriacum and 15′ of longitude to the west of it. Cape Alpreck has the same latitude as the supposed site of the *portus Itius* in the estuary of the Liane and is of course to the west of it. Again, notice that Ptolemy proceeding northwards places the headland between the Φρούδις (the Somme) and Boulogne, a fact which, so far as his authority goes, is decisive against Grisnez. The identity of Cape Alpreck with the Itian headland is strongly urged by M. l'Abbé Haigneré, Mr Appach and M. Desjardins, who all place the *portus Itius* at Boulogne, yet Mr Ridgeway says that 'the advocates of both Wissant and

[1] M. Desjardins gives as one of his arguments against Wissant "le peu de protection qu'offrait la soi-disant 'rade' de Wissant aux flottes des anciens, toujours si soucieux de donner un abri à leurs vaisseaux, et dont on ne peut pas citer un seul port exposé, comme l'eût été Wissant, aux vents et aux coups de mer." I must express my surprise that neither Mr Malden nor Mr Ridgeway makes any mention of M. Desjardins' great work Géographie de la Gaule Romaine, of which Vol. 1, published in 1876, contains a long and careful discussion of the various views that have been held on the subject of the *portus Itius*, concluding with a decisive and, to my mind, convincing verdict in favour of Boulogne. A recent editor of Caesar, Dr F. W. Kelsey of the University of Michigan, calls this work 'one of the finest historical monographs in any language.'

Boulogne support the claim of Grisnez'! Though Grisnez is the most prominent headland on the coast it is not the highest, for while Grisnez is 150 feet high, Alpreck is 180 and the hills behind it are higher still. It is probable too that in Caesar's time Alpreck projected into the sea much farther than it does now. (iv) I agree that Caesar started from the same port on both expeditions, but I do not agree that that port was Wissant. Mr Ridgeway says 'the bay lying between that cape and the village of Wissant, now blocked by sandbanks, but where there still existed a serviceable harbour until the 15th century, is a not unnatural place to regard as Caesar's *portus*, but since Dio (XL. 1) calls the place where Caesar landed in Britain a *νάνσταθμον*, any convenient beach then existing near Grisnez would suit just as well.' From the words 'there still existed a serviceable harbour until the 15th century' we might be led to conclude that Wissant was well known as a harbour from Roman times to the 15th century, but M. Haigneré has shown[1] that there is absolutely no trustworthy mention of Wissant as a harbour before the 10th century, and that it was only from 1013 to 1347 that it was of any importance as a seaport. On the other hand the evidence for Boulogne, or, more strictly speaking, for a point in the estuary of the Liane about 3 miles from the modern Boulogne, is very strong indeed. Recent investigations have shown that there was formerly ample room here for a fleet, and it is known by inscriptions found on the site to have been the station of the *classis Britannica*. For a full discussion of the evidence I must refer to M. Desjardins' book. The distance from Boulogne to Dover is about 31 English miles, which would correspond with sufficient accuracy to Caesar's estimate, *circiter milium passuum* XXX[2].

[1] As I learn from H. J. Heller in Philologus, Band XXII. (1865), p. 312. Heller's careful review of the then existing literature on the subject is well worth reading; but he had apparently not seen Vol. XXXIX. of the Archaeologia, published in 1863. He fully admits the plausibility of Haigneré's view that Alpreck is the Ἴτιον ἄκρον, though himself inclining to Wissant and Grisnez.

[2] Mr Ridgeway refers to a supposed reading XXXX in place of XXX, and is inclined to adopt it as agreeing exactly with Strabo's 320 stades. The geographer Ortel wished to do the

Mr Ridgeway invokes the aid of Strabo in support of his view that Wissant was Caesar's point of departure. Mr Malden replies by impugning the authority of Strabo, but in doing so lays himself open to some damaging criticism of which Mr Ridgeway takes advantage. But I cannot think Mr Ridgeway's defence of that geographer at all satisfactory. It may be useful to combine his various notices as to the relative positions of Gaul and Britain in order to form a just estimate of his geographical accuracy. This I proceed to do. Strabo imagines that the coast of Gaul, extending from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, runs parallel to the coast of Britain, extending from the easternmost point of Kent to the western extremity of the island (*πρὸς τὸ ἑσπέριον ἄκρον τῆς νήσου*). These two parallel shores are of equal length, viz. 4300 to 4400 stades. Four rivers enter the sea on this side of Gaul, the Rhine (opposite to, and visible from, Kent), the Seine (a little farther off from Britain), the Loire and the Garonne. The distance from the mouths of the rivers (*ἀπὸ τῶν ποταμῶν τῆς Κελτικῆς*) to Britain is 320 stades[1]. There are four ways of crossing from Gaul to Britain, viz., from the mouths of the Rhine, Seine, Loire and Garonne, but people starting from the districts about the Rhine (*τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ῥῆνον τόπων ἀναγομένοις*) do not sail from the river-mouths (*ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐκβολῶν*) but from the country of the Morini, among whom is also *τὸ Ἴτιον* which Caesar used as a roadstead (*ναυστάθμῳ*). He started at night and reached the opposite coast next day at the fourth hour, having traversed a distance of 320 stades[2].

same, as I learn from a note of Casaubon's in Falconer's edition of Strabo. But xxxx occurs in no known extant MS and it is doubtful whether it was ever found in any MS at all. The only authority for it that I can find is a certain Brantius (mentioned by Schneider *ad locum*), who professes to have seen it. Yet in his second article Mr Ridgeway says 'the fact however remains that in certain MSS of Caesar XL is read.' In what critical edition does he find it?

[1] This seems at variance with the statement quoted above that the Seine is a little farther off from Britain than the Rhine. Possibly Strabo only meant that it was a little farther from *Kent* than the Rhine.

[2] Strabo, IV. p. 199. Compare this with p. 194, where, after saying that Britain is 320 stades from the rivers of Gaul, he adds *ὑπὸ γὰρ τὴν ἄμπωτιν ἀφ' ἑσπέρας ἀναχθέντες τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ περὶ ὀγδόην ὥραν καταίρουσιν εἰς τὴν νῆσον*. Again, p. 189, *ἐκ δὲ τούτων* (the tribes

From this summary of Strabo's views I draw two conclusions, first, the obvious one that Strabo knew very little about the geography of this region; secondly, that his 320 stades does not represent a supposed XXXX in the text of Caesar. For Caesar says distinctly that the shortest crossing from Gaul to Britain was to be got by starting from the district occupied by the Morini, while Strabo appears to reckon 320 stades as the distance from the mouth of any one of the four chief rivers of western Gaul to the coast of Britain. But even if we admit that the 320 stades is meant by Strabo to represent 40 Roman miles in the text of Caesar, it does not necessarily follow that Caesar wrote XXXX. For if copyists whose business it was to transcribe a MS correctly often blundered in copying numbers, as Mr Ridgeway rightly says they did, why should we not suppose that Strabo, searching rapidly through a number of books for scraps of information bearing on his subject, might possibly have misread and miscopied his Caesar? Moreover we have Mr Ridgeway's own authority for saying that Strabo made little use of Caesar's Commentaries[1]. In fine, I conclude that we are not justified in building any argument as to the length of the passage from Gaul to Britain on the unsupported testimony of Strabo.

Again, while too much is, in my opinion, made of the testimony of Strabo, that of Pliny and of Pomponius Mela is ignored. Pliny who was born in A.D. 23, about the time of Strabo's death, says that the shortest passage from Gaul to Britain was from Gesoriacum on the seaboard of the Morini[2]; in another passage he speaks of it as *portus Morinorum Britannicus*. Pomponius Mela who was a contemporary of Pliny speaks of Gesoriacum as one of the best known harbours in the district. It is difficult to suppose then that Gesoriacum was not known to Strabo as a usual port for the passage to Britain.

bordering on the mouth of the Seine) *εἰς τὴν Βρεττανικὴν ἐλάττων ἢ ἡμερήσιος δρόμος ἐστίν*. How are we to reconcile these discrepancies?

[1] See article 'Strabo' in Encyclopaedia Britannica.

[2] Nat. Hist. IV. 30, § 1 *haec (Britannia) abest a Gesoriaco Morinorum gentis litore proximo traiectu quinquaginta millia;* cp. IV. 37, § 2. Pomponius Mela, III. 2, § 7.

Does not the conclusion lie on the surface, not only that it was known to him, but that it is indicated by him in his statement that one of the crossing places was in the country of the Morini? The Liane is an insignificant river and probably unknown to Strabo who, on this supposition, naturally designates Caesar's naval station as a *ναύσταθμον*[1]. To the objection that if Caesar had meant Gesoriacum he would have called the port by that name, Desjardins replies that the portus Itius was not quite the same place as the port of Gesoriacum, being farther up the estuary, though the two were of course liable to be confused.

B. We now come to the more difficult and, to us, more interesting question, as to Caesar's landing-place. Though still thinking that in some respects the coast near Deal suits the conditions of the narrative best, I freely confess that the official report drawn up by order of the Lords of the Admiralty by Mr E. K. Calver, confirming as it does in all essential points the previous report of Admiral Beechy, proves it to have been absolutely impossible, assuming of course that the tides were the same then as now, for Caesar to have proceeded from his anchoring-place eastward with the tide before 6.30 p.m. on the 27th of August, the date of his crossing[2]. If he had started

[1] Mr Ridgeway, Journal 38, p. 203, attaches to Strabo's *καί* more weight than in my judgement it will bear. Strabo had just said that there were four ways of crossing (*τέτταρα διάρματα οἷς χρῶνται συνήθως*), viz. from the rivers Rhine, Seine, Loire, Garonne. He then adds that persons coming from the Rhine district start not from the mouth of the Rhine, but from the country of the Morini 'among whom is also *τὸ Ἴτιον*' (*παρ' οἷς ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Ἴτιον*), which surely simply indicates the fact that, in addition to the four previously mentioned routes, there was also one among the Morini. Mr Ridgeway considers him to have meant that there is among the Morini the Itian port (promontory) *as well as the ordinary port of Gesoriacum*. If Strabo meant this, he must have had a curious way of expressing himself.

[2] The official report, with all the correspondence relating to it, will be found in Archaeologia, Vol. xxxix. (1863), pp. 277—314. I may remark here that the Rev. F. T. Vine (not Vines, as he is called by Mr Malden and Mr Ridgeway), in his interesting book 'Caesar in Kent' (2nd ed. 1887), wrongly follows Napoleon and Halley in giving the date as 25 August. The moon was full at 3 a.m. on 31 Aug., and Caesar says that on the preceding day (30 August) there was a storm which took place *post diem quartum*

from his moorings at this hour he could not have reached the beach at Deal before 7.30, or about half an hour after sunset, which would not have allowed time for the ensuing battle as described in the Commentaries. Most writers, indeed, take it for granted that we are bound by Caesar's words to assume that he left his moorings at 3 p.m. when the tide was running westward, but I agree with Guest and Heller in thinking that his language is not sufficiently precise to warrant such a conclusion.

Deal, then, being out of the question, the coast near Hythe at the north end of Romney Marsh is the best claimant to the honour of having first given foothold to the conqueror of Britain. The chief arguments in its favour have been so fully and ably stated by Mr Lewin[1] that I need not recapitulate them here. But I take this opportunity of making a few observations on the notes of time given by Caesar and on the interpretation attached to them by Mr Lewin, Mr Malden, Mr Ridgeway and others. With respect to the first invasion, Caesar tells us that the distance was about 30 miles, that he started *tertia fere vigilia*, and that he reached the British coast (presumably off the cliffs of Dover) with his first ships *hora circiter diei quarta*. On the night of the 26th—27th of August the third *vigilia* would be approximately 12 to 2.30 a.m.; the fourth hour of the day would be about 8.30 to 9.40 a.m.[2] The possible duration of the voyage therefore

quam est in Britanniam ventum: this would fix his arrival on the 27th, since by Roman reckoning the 30th would be *post diem quartum* in reference to the 27th. Hence it is not strictly correct to say, as the writers in the Journal of Philology do, that Caesar tells us that there was a full moon on the third day after his arrival. What Caesar says is that there was a full moon on the night succeeding the third day.

[1] Mr Malden, strange to say, writing in 1888, quotes from the first edition of Mr Lewin's book published in 1859; a fuller edition was published in 1862, and in February, 1863, the author read a paper entitled 'Further observations on the Landing of Caesar, in connection with the correspondence between the Society of Antiquaries and the Admiralty.' This paper will be found in Archaeologia, xxxix. pp. 309—314.

[2] Mr Malden commits himself to the statement that the Romans always reckoned their hours from 6 a.m. Mr Ridgeway seems to hold the same view.

lies between the extreme limits of 9 h. 40′ and 6 hours. If we take the mean and regard the time occupied by the transit as 8 hours, the rate of the first ships to arrive will be about 4 miles an hour, which agrees fairly well with Strabo's estimate as well as with the modern estimates given by Mr Malden. It is not certain whether the whole fleet started together; at any rate, it is clear from Caesar's own account that some of the ships were badly handled, and we are told that they did not arrive till the ninth hour, approximately 2.20 to 3.30 p.m., so that their average pace probably did not much exceed two miles an hour. The calculations of Sir G. Airy and Dr Guest, repeated by Mr Malden and Mr Ridgeway, are vitiated by the needless assumption that Caesar started about midnight and did not arrive with his first ships till about 10 a.m. Again, in respect to the second invasion, Mr Ridgeway assumes that Caesar started at 3 a.m. with the turn of the tide from the point to which he had drifted during the night, and that he reached his former landing-place at 12 noon. All that Caesar says is that at dawn (*orta luce*) he saw Britain on his left, and that he then followed the turn of the tide (*tum rursus aestus commutationem secutus*) and reached Britain *meridiano fere tempore*. The phrase *orta luce* is vague, the *tum* is vaguer still; this want of precision in notes of time and place is the besetting sin of all ancient historians, and you cannot base on such nebulous indications as these any exact calculations of distance or rate of speed. The starting on the right course with the turn of tide of a large and probably somewhat scattered fleet is not a momentary act which you can assign to a particular minute of the day, nor does the arrival of such a fleet at its destination admit of being fixed at a definite moment of time. This part of the voyage may have occupied nine hours, from 3 to 12, as Mr Ridgeway asserts that it did, but on the other hand the conditions of the narrative would be satisfied if we assumed that the fleet got fairly in motion with the tide at say 4 or even 4.30, and arrived at 11.30 or thereabouts, which would give a duration of between 7 and 8 hours for the distance. Unfortunately we do not

know the exact date of the second invasion, and therefore cannot tell when the changes of the tide took place. I should rather gather from Caesar's words that the tide began to flow north-eastwards about midnight or shortly before, in which case it could hardly have turned again at 3 a.m. But on this point no certainty is now attainable.

But, besides Deal and Hythe, there is a third possible landing-place at Pevensey Bay. The chief supporter, if not the originator, of this view was Sir G. Airy. Mr Ridgeway is perhaps the only modern scholar who has anything to say in its favour. One or two arguments against it have already been incidentally mentioned; to these I may add the extreme improbability that if Caesar had really crossed from Wissant to Pevensey, a distance of over 50 miles, he would have used language which the ordinary reader would undoubtedly understand to mean that he had crossed at what he considered the narrowest part. Again, Mr Malden points out that if Caesar had landed at Pevensey, he would have disembarked opposite the great Wealden forest. To this Mr Ridgeway triumphantly replies 'this is precisely what did happen.' It does not seem to me quite logical to assume as self-evident that the woods, of which Caesar speaks as affording shelter to the enemy, necessarily formed a part of the Wealden forest. It is generally agreed that the southern parts of England from Winchelsea westward were covered in early times with a dense forest, and I doubt very much whether Caesar would have attempted to march through it. Again, Caesar reckons the distance from his landing-place to the Thames, meaning no doubt the ford of the Thames, at 80 miles; the distance from Deal to Halliford in a straight line is apparently about 85 Roman miles, from Hythe to Halliford about 75, but from Pevensey to Halliford it is not more than 60. Then too there is the question of the tides which again confronts us. Mr Lewin has shown[1], on

[1] Supplement to Ed. 2 (1862), pp. xxxv. foll. This edition, containing a vigorous rejoinder to Sir G. Airy's criticism of the first edition, is apparently unknown to Mr Ridgeway. Whether Sir G. Airy ever replied to it or not I do not know: at any rate, in his paper read before the Society of Antiquaries in February, 1863, and published in Archaeologia, xxxix. pp. 303—308, he carefully avoids the subject of Pevensey.

what appears to be good authority, that with the conditions of time and tide assumed as correct by Sir G. Airy, that is, if high water was between 7 and 8 a.m. and if Caesar left his moorings, which could hardly have been more than a mile from the shore, about 3 p.m., the fleet would have been carried to the east of Hastings instead of to the west, owing to the peculiar action of the currents in this neighbourhood! Lastly, Caesar says that his eighteen transports, conveying his cavalry on the first expedition, when approaching Britain and in sight of the Roman camp, were caught by a storm which drove some of them back to the *portus superior* from which they had started, and others *ad inferiorem partem insulae quae est propius solis occasum.* How does Mr Ridgeway propose to explain the action of a storm which, falling on a number of ships somewhere off Pevensey Bay, could drive some of them back to Sangatte (which I suppose he takes to be the *portus superior*), and the rest westward along the south coast of Britain?

It will be observed that, in common with most of those who have written on this subject, I have taken it for granted for the sake of argument that in the first century B.C. the tides in the channel ebbed and flowed exactly at the same time as they do now at the corresponding relative positions of the sun, moon and earth. Sir G. Airy held that there had been no change. Dr Guest[1] was, I believe, the first to be sceptical. After describing the probable changes that the coast-line has undergone in 2000 years, he concludes that it is hazardous to assume that such changes have had no effect on the in-shore currents off Dover. A similar opinion is expressed by a more recent and a better authority, Captain Montagu Burrows, R.N., Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, who in his work on the Cinque Ports says, 'It is obvious to remark in reference to these coast changes that they can hardly but vitiate the calculations which have been held to decide the place of Caesar's landing in the Cinque Port districts. Not only may the depth of the channel have largely increased, but the space over which

[1] Archaeological Journal, xxi. (1864), pp. 220—242.

the tides travel must be at least two miles wider than it was some 2000 years ago, and therefore the point of meeting of the north and south tide-streams cannot possibly be exactly the same; yet this is the assumption under which all these calculations have been made.'

On such a point as this I can of course express no opinion, but I should be glad to believe in the possibility of such a change in the movements of the tides, for I still hold that in most respects the landing-place at Deal best suits the requirements of the narrative.

In conclusion, I must repeat that my object in writing this has been merely to call attention to a few points that seem to me to have been overlooked or inadequately treated by Mr Malden and Mr Ridgeway. To discuss the whole question fully would require a volume, and I have no desire to add to the existing literature on the subject.

A. G. PESKETT.

ON SOME PASSAGES OF THE HELENE OF EURIPIDES.

ΕΛ. *σκοπεῖτε μὴ δόκησιν εἴχετ' ἐκ θεῶν.*
ΤΕΥ. *ἄλλου λόγου μέμνησο, μὴ κείνης ἔτι.*
ΕΛ. *οὕτω δοκεῖτε τὴν δόκησιν ἀσφαλῆ ;*
ΤΕΥ. *αὐτὸς γὰρ ὅσσοις εἰδόμην, καὶ νοῦς ὁρᾷ.*
119—122.

The difficulty is in the last line which with the Mss reading is transparent nonsense. Hermann reads *αὔτως...καὶ νῦν σ' ὁρῶ* and thinks the correction obvious. Mr W. G. Clark (Journal of Philology, vol. iv.) would read *αὐτὸς γὰρ ὅσσοις εἶδον, εἰ καὶ νῦν σ' ὁρῶ*. He objects to the form *εἰδόμην* as very rare in Attic Greek ; but for this very reason it seems to me almost certainly genuine, and it occurs at any rate in Philoctetes 351.

I propose to change no letter of the Mss, but to read *καινοὶς ὅρα* for *καὶ νοῦς ὁρᾷ*. With *καινοὺς* I understand *λόγους* from l. 120 (*ἄλλου λόγου μέμνησο*) and the meaning of both lines is then practically the same, except that Teucer's second reply is somewhat curter than the first. The change of *καινοὺς ὅρα* to *καὶ νοῦς ὁρᾷ* is due to the perverse ingenuity of some scribe who doubtless prided himself upon the effective contrast he had introduced between seeing with the eyes and the mind's eye.

ἆρ' ἡ τεκοῦσά μ' ἔτεκεν ἀνθρώποις τέρας ;
γυνὴ γὰρ οὔθ' Ἑλληνὶς οὔτε βάρβαρος
τεῦχος νεοσσῶν λευκὸν ἐκλοχεύεται,
ἐν ᾧ με Λήδαν φασὶν ἐκ Διὸς τεκεῖν.
τέρας γὰρ ὁ βίος καὶ τὰ πράγματ' ἐστί μοι.
256—260.

Lines 257—259 sadly interrupt the sense, and I believe them to be an interpolation giving a wrong explanation of *τέρας* and to anticipate the true explanation which is given in l. 260.

ἀλλ' ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς
ξυνῇ γυναικὶ, καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἐστιν πικρόν.
l. 296—297.

τὸ σῶν, σώζεσθαι, δῶμ', βρῶμ', have all been proposed as corrections for *σῶμ'* but they do not seem satisfactory. I believe *πῶμ'* (an emendation proposed by me in the Classical Review) to be the true reading: the play on the words *πόσις, πῶμα* is quite in the manner of Euripides.

τάφον λιποῦσα τόνδε σύμμιξον κόρῃ,
ὅθενπερ εἶσει πάντα. τἀληθῆ φράσαι
ἔχουσ' ἐν οἴκοις τοῖσδε, τί βλέπεις πρόσω;
θέλω δὲ κἀγὼ σοὶ συνεισελθεῖν δόμους.
324—327.

There are various punctuations and interpretations of this passage. I should read *ὅθενπερ εἶσει πάντα τἀληθῆ φράσαι'* and explain it as follows. The Chorus advise Helen to consult Theonoe: 'from her,' they say, 'you shall know the whole truth, to tell it': they do not say 'to tell us' for they want to conceal the curiosity which they evidently feel: but their inquisitiveness overmasters them, and in the next line they offer to accompany Helen, alleging the very transparent excuse *γυναῖκα γὰρ δὴ συμπονεῖν γυναικὶ χρή.*

τί τάδ' ἀσύνετα;
φόνιον αἰώρημα
διὰ δέρης ὀρέξομαι,
ἢ ξιφοκτόνον δίωγμα
λαιμορύτου σφαγᾶς
αὐτοσίδαρον ἔσω πελάσω διὰ σαρκὸς ἄμιλλαν.
352—356.

The Editors are not agreed about the meaning of these first three words, some assigning them to Helen and some to the

Chorus. As a matter of fact it is wholly indifferent to whom they are assigned, for in either case they are destitute of any intelligible meaning. I believe them to be the despairing comment of some copyist written over the words that follow: and if he found the passage as we have it, I do not see what other comment was possible. 'What is the meaning of this nonsense?'

ὦ μάκαρ Ἀρκαδίᾳ ποτὲ παρθένε Καλλιστοῖ, Διὸς
ἃ λεχέων ἐπέβας τετραβάμοσι γυίοις,
ὡς πολὺ ματρὸς ἐμᾶς ἔλαχες πλέον,
ἁ μορφᾷ θηρῶν λαχνογυίων
ὄμματι λάβρῳ σχῆμα λεαίνης
ἐξαλλάξασ' ἄχθεα λύπης· 375—380.

Some verb is absolutely required to govern σχῆμα, and λεαίνης gives no sense. Of the corrections proposed διαίνεις and ἀγριαίνεις are perhaps the best, but neither seems quite satisfactory. I suggest λεαίνεις, probably the slightest change possible, and should translate 'Thou who in the shape of furry beasts with bright eye dost smooth over thy change of form by having obtained release from grief.' I imagine the word λεαίνεις to have been chosen for the contrast with λαχνογυίων.

λέξω τάδ' ἀμφὶ μνῆμα σοῦ πατρὸς πόθῳ. l. 961.

I suggest σπόδῳ for πόθῳ as the smallest possible change, and πόθῳ seems hardly defensible, as Proteus himself is addressed in the words that follow ὦ γέρον, ὃς οἰκεῖς τόνδε λάϊνον τάφον.

In 965 ἀποδώσεις is the correction of Stephanus for ἀπολέσεις. I suggest ἀπολύσεις as a slighter change, with the meaning to set at liberty.

ἦ νῦν ἐκείνους ἀπόδος ἐμψύχους πάλιν,
ἦ τήνδ' ἀνάγκασόν γ' εὐσεβοῦς πατρὸς
κρείσσω φανεῖσαν τἄμ' ἀποδοῦναι λέχη.
972—974.

τἀμά γ' is generally accepted as a satisfactory correction of the third line: μὴ εὐσεβοῦς πατρὸς ἥσσω φανεῖσαν is Her-

mann's restoration of the preceding passage. This does not seem to me probable, in spite of his positive "scripsit Euripides": I believe *πάτρας* to be the right reading: if the original was *δυσσεβοῦς πάτρας*, the change of one letter *πατρὸς* for *πάτρας* would inevitably result in *εὐσεβοῦς* being substituted for *δυσσεβοῦς*, for *δυσσεβοῦς πατρὸς* would be obviously absurd as applied to Proteus. On my view Theonoe is implored to show herself superior to the impiety of her country, and Egypt is not unnaturally considered as being identified with the policy of her present king.

ἐπ' οἰάκων δὲ βὰς
ἄναξ ἐς Ἑλλάδ' εἶπεν εὐθύνειν δόρυ.
1610, 1611.

ἄνακτα is read by Jerram, "the correction of Kirchhoff and Lightfoot for *ἄναξ*, a term unlikely to have been applied to Menelaus by the messenger." I should keep *ἄναξ* but understand it as the vocative addressed to Theoclymenus to call attention to and perhaps apologise for the startling statement that follows.

εἰς μὲν γὰρ ἀεὶ τὸν παρόντα νῦν χρόνον
κείνην κατοικεῖν σοῖσιν ἐν δόμοις ἐχρῆν·
ἐπεὶ δὲ Τροίας ἐξανεστάθη βάθρα
καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς παρέσχε τοὔνομ', οὐκέτι
ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς δεῖ νιν ἐζεῦχθαι γάμοις
ἐλθεῖν δ' ἐς οἴκους καὶ συνοικῆσαι πόσει.
1650—1655.

But *ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς γάμοις* cannot mean 'the marriage you had intended for her,' and must refer to the marriage of Helen and Menelaus. The only remedy hitherto suggested has been to bracket line 1653. I propose to put a stop after *οὐκέτι* and read *εἰ* for *ἐν* in the next line. 'After Troy had fallen and she had lent her name to the gods, it was no more fated (for Helen to live in your house), since she must be united to Menelaus as before.'

I may be allowed to add to these notes a suggestion on Wasps 1090, a line generally admitted to be corrupt. The passage is

ἆρα δεινὸς ἦ τόθ' ὥστε πάντα μὴ δεδοικέναι.

The objection to this is that *ὥστε πάντα μὴ δεδοικέναι* can hardly mean 'so that I was afraid of nothing,' and further that is not quite the sense required. The Chorus have said 'Was I not terrible then' and should add 'so that all men feared me,' not 'so that I was afraid of nothing.' I propose to omit one *δ*, and read *ὥστε πάντα μήδ' ἐοικέναι*, 'so that all similes fail to do me justice.' The Chorus have just compared themselves to wasps: even this comparison, they say, is inadequate, they were so terrible, *ὥστε πάντα μηδ' ἐοικέναι.*

HUGH MACNAGHTEN.

THE REHDIGER MS OF *AETNA*.

In the summer of the present year (1891) I continued (after an interruption due to the important work of Prof. Paul Thomas on Manilius[1], the *Lucubrationes Manilianae*, Gandavi (Ghent), 1888) the researches, which I had commenced in 1886 at Paris, and continued in 1887 for two months in the Vatican and other libraries at Rome, into the history of the MSS of the pseudo-Vergilian opuscula. With this purpose I visited Munich and afterwards Breslau.

The Rehdiger collection of MSS in the public library of Breslau contains two copies of the *Aetna*, both of xvth century. They are numbered 125 and 60. Rehd. 125 is famous as containing one of the best copies yet known (the Madrid MS is still an *arcanum*) of the *Silvae* of Statius. It includes, besides, the Vergilian *Catalepta*, the *Ciris*, and the *Aetna*. It is written in an exquisite hand, a fact which I mention here in order to controvert a prevailing belief, based no doubt on many instances, but only partially true, that 15th century MSS are worthless in proportion to their calligraphy. The fact, of course, is that the goodness or badness of a MS has little or nothing to do with the writing. Where the scribe continued his labour from one poem (say, the *Silvae*) to another (say, the *Ciris*) in the same volume, it naturally happened that the copies used would be of variable goodness, and quite different values. Hence the fact, which is beyond doubt, of the same MS presenting, though written all through by the same hand, a text of very different excellence in different parts. The exquisite Tours[2] Ovid, which

[1] Wagler, *de Aetna poemate*, p. 64, thinks the author of the *Aetna* imitated Manilius.

[2] See the facsimile given in Mr S. G. Owen's octavo edition of Ovid's *Tristia*.

ranks with the Galeanus of Trinity College, Cambridge, as one of the two earliest and best sources for the *Ibis*, is by no means equally trustworthy in the *Heroides*. The same thing is true of Rehd. 125. Its text is not as good in any of the pseudo-Vergilian poems as in the *Silvae*[1].

As the *Aetna* is difficult enough to justify the publication of a MS belonging to the better, in the main uninterpolated class (Rehd. 60 is *not* such), I collated the whole of Rehd. 125 with the text of the poem as given by Wernsdorf: for Munro's edition was not in the Breslau library, and Bährens' text is so arbitrarily changed by transpositions and uncertain emendations as to be of little use for collating.

3 Quid fremat imperium
5 Seu tibi do dodona potior tecumque fauentis
6 Seu te cynthus habet: seu delos gratior illa
7 In noua
8 cautius
9 securi qui
11 Venturisque malis p. frondibus herbas
12 Annua sed saturę complebant (*sic*) horrea messes

13 Penderet foliis et pingui pallas oliua
14 Secretos annis ageret: tum gratia ruris

19 et tristi natorum funere matrem
20 Aduersumue diem s. de saemine dentem
21 p pupis
22 littore quęstus
23 Quicquid in antiquum iactata est fabula carmen

[1] Munro ranks Rehd. 125 among the best MSS of the *Aetna*, basing his judgment on Jacob's collation. At the time I made my own collation, I was not aware that Jacob had collated the MS for his edition. But as his book is not easily procurable and Munro only gives *occasional* readings from the MS (which is ϵ in his edition), it seems worth while to exhibit it as a whole consecutively: by which the reader will better be able to judge of its worth than if he had to pick it out from the vv. ll. of several MSS. I may add that it is indubitably of Cent. xv, as Munro, who seems not to have seen it, divined (p. 28).

24 mollimur
25 Quis tantos motus reperit quis tanta perhemni
26 Explicat in densum flamma extrudat ab imo
27 Ingenti sonitu mollescit proxima quęque
29 ne quis capiat

33 neque extrema ius est demittere in arces
34 seducto regnam
35 Illa nec artificum
36 facies hec
38 fontes
39 sub pectore fulmen
40 turpe est
42 l
solicitet phlegreis
h
43 Temptauere nefas olim deturdere

46 His naturę suę aluo tenus una per orbes
47 intortus
48 montibus
49 Pelleon ossa creat

52 Prouocat infensus cunctos ad prelia diuos
52ª Prouocat . . . . . ad motus . . . . . (*sic*)
53 Iuppiter e caelo meruit dextraque coruscam
54 Admotus flamam remouet caligine mudum
56 geminātque fauentes
57 Undique discordes comitum simul agmine uenti
58 Densa per attonitas funduntur fulmina nubes
59 Et[1] qꝫ in . . . . . (*sic*)
60 Et mars scaeuus erat iam cetera turba deorum
61 Stat utruque deus ualidos tum iupiter (*sic*) ignes
62 Increpat et uictor
63 Illinc deuictę

66 Impellens uictos tunc

[1] The v. which follows this in *C* (the Cambridge MS) *In commune uenit iam patri dextera Pallas* is omitted in Rehd. 125.

67 Tum liber celsa uenit per sydera caelum
68 Defensique deus mudi tunc redditur astris
70 encheladum
71 expirat ignem
72 mendosę phamae
73 Vatibus ingenium est hic audit
74 Plurima pars scenea uerum est fallacia uates
75 Subterius nigros uiderunt carmine manes
77 canentes
78 Hi tycion poena foedum
79 Solicitant illi te circum tantale poena
80 tuque eace
81 isonis orbem
82 Quicquid et interius falsi consortia terrent
83 Hec ut uera satis speculantur numine diuum
84 metuĩt oculis
pecccẽt [*sic*]
87[1] in Europam

91 Aestuat congerat
92 Quacuque
93 curuis hic agitur undis
94 Non totum et solidum desunt : namque omnis hiatus

96 inque animanti
98 Ad uitam sanguis omnis qua comeat idem
99 Terra uoraginibus conceptas dirigit auras
100 Scilicet aut olim
101 sydera : dataque caelo
102 secuta m. descendit (in *om.*) infima tellus
103 aceruans
104 Exiit imparibus iactis ex tempore saxis
105 Vt crebro introrsus spacio . . . . . [*sic*]
106 futurę
107 In tenuis in arcum
108 cohit

[1] The v. which follows this in *C Iuppiter ut Danae pretiosus fluxerit imber* is omitted in Rehd. 125.

109 sed liber spiritus intra
110 molitur iter sed lympha perenni
111 Edit humum binum moli
112 Haud etiam inclusi solidum uidere uaporem
114 non est ibi causa dolendi
115 Dum stet opus causae quis enim . . . . . [*sic*]
116 emergere fontes
117 torrens uno se mergere hiatu
118 Non illo ex tenui uocem que agat apta n. est
119 Confluit errantes arcessant undique et undas
120 Extrahat ex pleno quod fonte contrahat amnem
121 riuis
122 haud illa
123 Dirrepta
126 Quod si diuersos emitat
127 Hospicium fluminum uel semina
128 constet uia
129 Conserta in gelidum segnis
130 terrae
131 si qua etiam incondita
133 pignora
134 hesura uix dabitur
135 Immensum plerumque sinus
136 Inter certa leget noctis
137 caos ac sine fine ruinae
138 Ceruus et in siluis spatioque c. retro
139 Antraque demissa pedibus fudisse latebris
140 tamen effluit intra
142 due
143 Occultamque abstrahe uerba
145 Semper inclusis nec uectus scaeuior ira est
146 Sub terra penitusque mouet hoc plura
147 soluant pellant
148 Nec tamen in rigidos haesit conteta canales
149 Visa nimis flāma urit : quam proxima cedunt +
150 Obiquamque secat qua uisa t. causa
151 ubi densus hiatus
153 solidos instaret inani

155 confertim mobilis esset
156 congredere causis
oris
158 Quae ualida in promptu cernis ualidosque recesus
159 Fallere sed nundum tibi lumine certaque retro
160 Namque illud quodcumque uacat hiatū pecus omnis
161 Et rosae introuitu solũnt

163 Quippe ubi contineat uentosa quęque morantis
164 In uacuo desinit cessa tantumque profundi
165 Explicat errantis et in ipso limite tradant
166 turbare in f. illos
167 Feruet opus densique premunt premitque ruinas
168 Hic furtim boreeque noto nunc huius uterque est
169 Hinc hinc scaeuo quassat hiatu
170 solo

172 antiqui faciem
173, 4 *as Wernsdorf*
175 est *om*
177 Occurent oculis ipsi

180 Corrigit hic artus: penitusque exigit ultra +
181 Hinc spissae
Inter opus nectunt uarios mediosque coercent
Pars igni domite pars ignes ferre coactę
184 Vt maior speties aethnae succurrat inanis
185 Haec illis tantarum sedeque circa rerum est
186 incendia causamque
187—9 *as Wernsd. except* uera *in* 188
190 moneant contingere toto
191 custodiaque ignis
192 Illi opertum est arcent dictis diuinaque rerum +
192[a] Vt maior speties ethnae succurrat inanis (*sic*)
193 Cura sine arbitrio est eadem: procul omnia cernis
194 Non tamen dubium penitus quin torqueat aethna
195 imperat

Pellitur exutae glomerantur nimbus harenę[a]
Flagrantes poperant (*sic*) molles
198 nunc rupitur aethna
Nunc fusta pallent incendi mixta ruina
203 Vertit in occulto tantum premit omnia dextra
204 operis
205 Quęm nec sponte sua fatiunt nec corporis ulli
206 robustis uiribus omnis
207 Exigitur uetitur saxa uertice . . . . . +
208 In densum cõiecta rotant
Hac cã (*i.e.* causa) expectata
Spiritus inflatis nomen languentibus aer
211 Nam pro poena quicquam par est uoluentia semper

213 corpore nullus

215 Nunc princeps magnusque s. h. d. militat ignis
operi natura
216 Vna ipsi uenti queres i. pascit
218 Cum subito

221 Non oculis pecudum miranda fuere [*sic*]

223 Nosce fidem rebus dubiasque exposcere causas
224 Sacra per ingentem capitique attollere caelum
225 Scire quod et que sint in magno talia mundo
226 metiunt ad sęcula pergunt
227 machina mundo
228 obita lunę est
229 Cheo breuior cur subiisse peruolet orbis
230 Annus ille mouet
231 Ordine que ue suo errant incondita cura
232 signorum tradita iura
233 terris déuítiet imbres
234 phoebe igne
235 uariant anni primaque iuuenta
236 Cur ęstate perit : cur aestas ipsa senescat

240 quę stella tenax que

243 serus incubet
244 iacent
245 Non digesta patri
248 hominis cura est cognoscere terram
250 Haec nobis magna affinis
251 Nam que mortalis spes est: que amatia maius
252 perquire uelle
253 Tantum opus transire et perdere segnes
254 Torquemur miseri in paruis premimurque laboris
255 Dum se se precio redimant uerumque professa est
256 uiles taceant

Collent rure expellimur usu
i
259 Fertilis hęc segetęque uiti

261 Haec duuti (*no dots over the first part of the word*)
262 oleo succosior ulmus

264 Horrea uti saturent tundant et dolia musto
265 reuilia

266 Sicca uidi semper qua uisum est carior istis
267–8–9 (*in Wernsdorf*), *in Rehd.* 125 *follow* 275 *Wernsd. after* nec credere subter
270 Implendus sibi quisque bonis est artibus : illis
272 Scire quod occulto
273 muto
274 animisque furentis
275 Non subito callere sono non credere subter
267 Scrutamur rimas: et uertimus
269 Torquentur fama terre ferroque domantis
s
276 Celesti migrase minas
277 Nosce quod impediat
278 pax sit
279 Concrescant animi penitus: seu forte c.

281 Rara foraminibus. neue uissę abtrahat (*sic*) a.
282 Plenius hoc etiam rigido qua uertice surgit
283 Illinc infoestus atque hinc obnoxia uitis
284 Vndique aduersas admittere cogitat auras
285, 6 *as in Wernsdorf*
287 Seu forte
288 Prȩcipiti delecta sono premit una fugatque
289 *as in Wernsdorf*
290 Nam ueluti sonat ora diu tritona canoro
291 Pellit opes collectus aquę uictusque mouere

293 magnis cortina theatris
295 Que tenuem impellens amena subr. unda
296 summota correntibus
297 *as in Wernsd.*
298 causam
299 Sub terra similis
300 Vt cum densa cremant inter se corpora turba
301 *as in Wernsd.*
302 Nomina tota trahunt tutaque in sede resistunt
303 *as in Wernsd.*
304 Principiis aliis credas consurgere ventos
305 Num dubium rupes aliquas penitusque c.
306 P.... ingenti sonitu cāuque propinqūas
307, 8 *as in Wernsd.*
309 Aut
310 *as in Wernsdorf*
311 uix proxima
312 Et minus aspirat fortis et uerberat aer
313 in uacuos si rerum est
314 Nec plura efficiunt infra clusique necesse est
315 His agitur causis extra penitusque coactis
316 Exagitant uentos pugnant in faucibus arctae
317 inter
318 est hausta graues ubi pibere euros
319 Ingeminat fluctus et primus
320 astrictus
321 *as in Wernsdorf*

322 *is omitted, but before* 323 *is* ⁂ (*mark of omission*) *The v. is written in Rehd.* 125 *after* 340 *with* ⁂ *prefixed*
323 Et quacûque iter est properat transitque morantem
324 Donec cum fluuio: ueluti ..... (*sic*)
325 Exilit
326 putas idem
327 atque idem pulsis remeare notanda
328—330 *as in Wernsdorf*
331 Illinc calligine
332 Pigraque deffusso circum stupet humida uultu
333 Prospectat sublimis opus uastosque receptus
[*This is the order of Rehd.* 125: *Jacob transposed* 333, 332.]
334 Non illam uidet aethna non nullo incercepit ęstu (*sic*)
335 redditque

337 aethnae
338 In prospectus
339 inritet
340 Huic igitur credis torrens ut spiritus illi *then*
⁂ Densa per ardentes exercet corpora uires

341 notat
342 Cur exit uires
343 *as in Wernsdorf*
344 Corpora diripiat ualidosque absolueret arcu
345 Quod ni fallor adest speties tantusque ruinis
346 Impetus attentos occulorum trasfugit ictus
347 Nec leuitas tantos igitur ferit aura: mouetque
348 S sparsa
349 Verberata tamen pulsataque corpora nostra
350 Incursant adeo in tenui uim clausaque repellit
351 non *om.*
352 Gramina non tenuis plantis exit humor aṗndas + (*i.e.* aprendas)
353 adoratis
354 et pax inoxia rapti
355 Siue peregrinus igitur propriisque potentis
356 Coniurā animę casus illic impetus ignis

357 Et montis partes atras subuectat harena
358 *as in Wernsdorf*
359 rupunt
360 Aut aliter
361 *as in Wernsdorf*
362 hęc serpunt iunctis incendia ramis
363 solidi
h
364 Exaustos
365 Haud rapiant uires repetantque in p̂ꝑlia uicti
(*i.e.* preelia, *with the second e erased*)
366 flammam
367 diuitiis iam
368 Nec paruo cōrogat
369 operi sempeꝛr [*sic*]
370 Causaꝭe latent : quęrunt pariter cogantque morari
371 extructa
372 *as in Wernsdorf*
373 Escisso ueluti tecto sub p. prestat
374 Haud sitis teneros cur secum frigida monti
375 descendere montes
376 Post ubi conticuere mora
377 oppositi
378 Quicquid in obliquū est
381 Si cessat á (*sic*) iure ferunt
382 regant incedia (*sic*)
383 uocent quod n. ethna
384 Incendi poterūnt (*sic*) illis uernacula causis
385 Materia : appositumque igni genus utile terrent
386 cAlidus nunc sulphuris humor
387 prebet munimine siccus
388 quicquid cominus acris
389 Irritat
390 fontes
391 Infectę eripiant aquę
392 dura est
393 Ac lapis
394 Quin etiam uanę quedam sine nomine saxa

395 liquent
396 *as in Wernsdorf*
397 Illius incendia lapis sic uendicat aethnam +
398 teneas a robore cernas
399 Nec fruere potes
400 Sed simul ac ferro quaeras
401 Scintillat dolor hunc multis circuisse flamis
402 Et pater extorquere
404 ubi coquitur igni
405 non tutior haustu
406 duramque tenaci
407 Septa fides : tutum est illi patientia uicto
408 Vix numquam
409 Totus enim dense stipatur robore tardans
410 *as in Wernsdorf, but* tenuis *and* incedia
411 Cunctarêque eadem et pigra cœpta remittit
412 *as in Wernsdorf*
413 Vincat et incendi causam tenet ille profecto
414, 415 *as in Wernsd.*
416 nec crescat
417 Quid repetas tantum et sine semine terra est
(cinis *omitted*)
418 Si semel ac iterum p. ac mille perhaustis
419, 420 *as in Wernsdorf*
421 delapsus
422 Cerne locis etiam similes adscisse cauernas
423, 4, 5 *as in Wernsdorf*
426 Dicitur insidiis flagrans : en aera quondam
427 Nunc extincta super tectisque neapolis inter
428 Atque cumas locus multis i. f. a. [est *om*].
429 pinguescat ex
430 legitur : tanto est foecundus
431 faties rotunda
432 Sulphure non solum nec obesa acumine terra est
433 Et lapis adiutat gerendis
434 fumat et uix
435 In breue m. flammās quod copia nutrit
436 Insula durata uulcani nomine sacra

437 *as in Wernsdorf*
438 Iactactatas [*sic*]
439 Qui restat
440 Sed non ęthnei uires que conferat illi
441 *as in Wernsdorf*
442 Ni furtim adgenerat . . . . . [*sic*]
443 Materiam siluamque suam pressoue canali
444 Huc illuc ageres uentos et posceret ignes
445 Sed melius res nocte ipsa spectataque uenis
446 Occurit signis nec teptat fallere pestem
447 *as in Wernsdorf*
448 Contendens saxi
449 manifeste ut
450 *as in Wernsdorf*
451 deffectus ieiunos colligit ignis
452 iacet
453 *as in Wernsdorf*
454 Haud equidem mirum scute quod c. extra +
455 Sed lenitur opus restąt magis : lenitur illic [*sic*]
456 ꝺicina
458 curis turbamque mimutus
459 Diffugit extemploque solum trahit ictaque ramis
460 *as in Wernsdorf*
461 confugere rebus
462 Parere et tuto collis +
463 numerossa incedia raptis
464 molles tructęque ruinę
465 *as in Wernsdorf, but* harenae
The 2 *vv.* Illinc incertae facies
Pars lapidum domita
are not in Rehd. 125
466 Nec recipit flamās : nec hic defessus hanelat
467 Atque aperit hostis decrescit spiritus illic +
468 *as in Wernsdorf*
469 Prima iacet
470 *as in Wernsdorf*
471 Asperior sopita est et quędam sordida fas est
472 cernes descendere

473 exiluit caducis
474 Congeries saxis angusto uertice surgunt
475 ueluti in fornace l. torquetur et omnis
476 Exutus penitus uenis subit altius humor
477 *as in Wernsdorf*
478 Exquoquitur . . . . seruare
479 procere tandem
480 dimittit
481 Ille
482 cartis : nil
483 frusta pugnant
484 Nunc siluę rupesque notant hec tela solumque
485 Ipsa adiutat opes facilesque sibi induit annis
486 uasibus exit
487 inequales
488 Ingeminãt
489 Sicut cum rapidum curuum mare tę̃ulus (taernulus) a.
490 Ad primum tenuis . . . . . agit ulteriores
491 et sucernens
492 Flumina consistunt ripis ac frigore durant
Paulatimque ignes coeunt ac flammea messis
494 tunc
495 Effumat atque ab ipso
496 *as in Wernsdorf*
497 Cum solido inflexa est pulsatos dissipat ictus
498 Et qua disclusa est cadenti
499 Emicat examen plagis ardentia saxa
500 Scintilla procul esse fide procul esse ruentem
501 Incolumi feruore cadunt uerum impetus ignes
502 Si uel fumanti ut ripas t. a. [quondam *om*]
503 Vix iunctis quisqȝ fixo dimouerat illas
504 Vicinos persaepe dies molles
505, 6 *as in Wernsdorf*
507 fruere igne fauillam
508 Plurima pro pietate concrescere siue
509 Conustum bitumina
510 Nam post exhaustam cretam quoque robora fundit
511 Et singulos huic esse fidem

512 Duriciam
513 comune
514 Que trepidant : uerum ubi pignore constat
515 naturę aëris et ignis
516 Condomitum est constat eademque et robore saluo
517 Vtramque ut portam
518 Aut aliter
519 Effluit siue est securus
520 uultu perdidit ignis
521 Q. etiam externam multus color ipse resoluit
522 Non odor aut leuitas : putris magis ille magisque
523 Vna operis facies eademque p. omnia terra est
524 *as in Wernsdorf*
525 propala uirtus
526 Qin
527 frichas atque ipso nomine signant
528 Fusiles esse notas
529 foueat succentior
530 *as in Wernsdorf*
531 fixile
532 Heracliti et ubi est nihil in superabile gigni
534 Omnia quae rerum natura semina iacta
535 Sed nimium hoc mirum densissima
536 solida
537 Namque animo seruis flamis subcubere
538 *as in Wernsdorf*
539 igni 540 *as in Wernsdorf*
541 Exudant pretium et
543 ingenium
544 friget percussusque
545 Si paruis terre uelis
546 praessoque
549 aurem
550 Possum namque tanta
551 Sustentare opibus tantis fornacibus
Vritura sacro numquam nec
553 *as in Wernsdorf*
554 proprior

555 *as in Wernsdorf*
556 astrictus elisis faucibus ut cum
557 Fabriles opera erudibus contendere massis
559 Examinant
560 fama est
561 uiret trahit urget in arcu
562 Spiritus incendi uiuit
563 uiscere
564 sacra uetustas
565 Tracti materia et terris
568 circudata meoenia thebis
569 Cernereque et fratres ille impiger ille canorus
570 Condere felicesque alieno transumere aeuo
571 Inuitata pio nunc carmine saxa lyraque
572 Nunc gemina ex uno fumatia saxa uapore
574 eurothas illic et sparsa lygurge
575 seu turba recenti
576, 7 *as in Wernsdorf*
578 Exicit
579 promittere uella
580 carmen
581 Erigone sedes uestra emphiloma canoris
582 Euocat in siluis
583 terrens f. exultat
584 *as in Wernsdorf*
585 extinctosque suos frigas hectora primum
587 et uictum
588 graiae fixas timuere tabellas
589 Signaue nunc pafle rorantia parte camilli +
590 cholchide
591 Nunc tristes circa subiecta altaria ceruę
592 puer nuc maronis
593 Et iam illa manus operum tubeque morantẽ
594 *as in Wernsdorf* 595 aspice nulla
596 Cum tanta humanis phoebus spectacula cernes
597 Precipueque uigil feruens ubi syrius ardens
599 Nec minus ille pio quamquam sors nobilis ignis

600 Nam quando ruptis exaduit aethna cauernis
601 ignes
602 Et uecta in longum rapidis est *om.*
603, 4 *as in Wernsdorf*
605 Ardebant agris segetes et millia culta
606 Iugera cum domibus siluę collesque uirebant
607 putant tremebant
609 uires animusque rapinae
610 opus
612 Defectum raptis : illum sua carmina tardant
613 nimio
614 cumque fuit
615 *as in Wernsdorf*
616 Cum tantos uorat ignis et unda torret auaros
617 ratis
618 Concrepat et nulli sparsura i. pascunt
619 Vel solis sparsura (deis *om*).
620 pari sub munere sortis
622 matreque senẽque
623 Seu iam defesso possuissent lumine membra
624 manu dicens attolite
625 *as in Wernsdorf*
626 Hanc rapies
627—630 *as in Wernsdorf*
631 inoxia terrae
632 Dextera scaeua tenent
633 Ille p. obliquos ignes fratremque triumphos
634 sufficit illam
636 tander
(*the last letter may be altered from* n : *it never was* tandem. *Perhaps* tarde.
638 Ille se posuit claro sub nomine dictis
639 fata
640 Sed iure iura

I will add some suggestions which occurred to me while making the above collation : as I have already discussed many passages in an article, mostly written amid the ruins of Casa-

micciola in 1887, and published in vol. XVI of this Journal, pp. 236 sqq., my new suggestions will be comparatively few.

23. *Quicquid in antiquum iactata est fabula carmen.*

Munro does not convince me that we have here the first and last halves of two truncated lines. May not *iactata* be a mistake for *iaculata?* 'whatever legend has wildly thrown into antique song,' i.e. all the fantastic legends of ancient poetry.

26, 7 (25, 6 Munro) Rehd. perhaps points to

> Qui tanto motus operi, *uis quanta* perennis
> Explicet in densum flammas.

41 (42). Is not the meaning rather, that the legend of Enceladus disturbs the dignity of Aetna by impiously explaining its fire as caused by the battle of the Giants? *Impia* as profaning nature's law, in close connexion with *sollicitat.* Why should the Giants and Phlegra be brought to bear upon this great phenomenon of nature? It is a violation and a profanity.

52ª (53). Perhaps *per territa sidera.* This supposes that *p* was changed into *q*, at some stage in the copying of the poem, perhaps before it was written in minuscule. This change of the two letters is at any rate a palaeographical fact which it may be useful to attend to. *Territa* for *tertia* of MSS is due to Wassenberg, and seems by far the nearest approximation to a probable conjecture yet offered.

67 (69). If *binum* of Rehd. in 111 (113) represents *limo*, it seems possible that *caelum* in 67 (69) is a mistake for *caelo.* The verse would then be, according to my conj. in vol. XVI. p. 294,

Tum Liber cessata uenit per sidera caelo.

94 (96). For *desunt* of *C* (the Cambridge MS) *S* (fragm. Stabulense) and Rehd., others give *desinit.* The Italian scholars of saec. XV. are credited with the emendation *defit*, which Munro accepts. Bährens gives *distat.* Perhaps it is *ducit; hiatu* or *hiatus* will then become *hiatum.*

> *Non totum ex solido est: ducit namque omnis hiatum,*
> *Secta est omnis humus.*

112 (114). *Aut etiam inclusi solidum nidere uapores. vicere* whether attributable to de Serionne or Sevin is rightly preferred to *fudere* (M.) by Wagler *de Aetna poemate*, p. 52.

126, 7 (128, 9). *Quod si diuersos emittat terra canales Hospitium fluuium aut semita.* So *C* and *S*. 128 *ni* Jacob 129 *fluminum* Rehd. and the Helmstadt MS *aut* CS *uel* Rehd. *semina* Rehd.

Since C S both give *fluuium*, Rehd., Arundel 133 and the Helmstadt MS (H) *fluminum*, it would seem improbable that *fluuiorum* can be right. Unger has suggested (J. of Philol. XVI. p. 314) *Hospitium in fluidum*. This not over-common adjective is generally written in MSS *fluuidus*, and this would easily and naturally, in the neuter, drop its *d* and become *fluuium*. I should however prefer then to write after Rehd. *Hospitium fluidum uel semita*, as, if the poet added *in*, propriety of language would require *Hospitium in fluuiorum* to which *aut semita* would be appended somewhat harshly. Or is *fluuium* genitive plural? Neue supplies numerous instances of such contracted genitives from nouns of the second declension.

131 (133). *Condita si redeunt si qua †etiam incondita surgunt.*

The correction *si quaedam* is not so certain that de Serionne's should not be mentioned, *si qua ante*, or Unger's *si quae clam condita* (p. 315).

156—9 (158—161) are thus given in *CS*:

> *Sed subitis si forte putas concredere causis*
> *Tantum opus et summis alimentum uiribus oris*
> *Quae ualida in promptu cernis ualidosque recessus*
> *Fallere sed nondum tibi lumine certaque retro.*

Putting aside as of uncertain validity the readings of this passage reported from the Gyraldinus, *concrescere* 158, *subitis* 159, *patula—uastosque* 160, *certo tibi lumine res est* 161, I would write the verses thus:

> *Sed subitis si forte putas concedere causis*
> *Tantum opus adsumptis alimentum uiribus, ora*
> *Qua uacua in promptu cernis uacuosque recessus,*
> *Falleris, et nondum tibi lumine certa liquet res.*

'But should you fancy this great working is due to overpowering sudden causes, when the materials of its fury have received an accession of force, at the point where you see and can point to vacant chasms and vacant withdrawing spaces, you are deluded and the matter is not yet revealed to you in a clear certain light.'

Subitis causis is explained by *sumptis alimentorum* (Neue I. p. 114) *uiribus:* the eruption (*opus*) is caused (*ex hypothesi*) by some sudden accession of strength in the forces which are at work within the mountain; these find a vent in some of the wide open chasms seen on Aetna. This, says the poet, is a wrong explanation: the breadth or size of the chasm acts rather as a retarding cause, and the supposed reinforcement of strength in the materials which produce the eruption, at the point where the chasm broadens, a delusion. *ora* is in Rehd. and must be right: *uacua uacuosque* for *ualida ualidosque* is no violent change: for the only possible sense assignable to this last (the reading of both *C* and *S*) would be 'chasms and clefts that *prove the strength* of the forces that caused them.' This would be intelligible with *Quod* for *Quae:* the view to which the poet objects might then be stated thus: the eruptions of Aetna are due to sudden causes and temporary accessions of violence within: of this violence the huge and yawning fissures on its surface are a proof.

159 (161) which I corrected as above in my former article p. 297, is in form very like Grat. Cyn. 80 *Turbat odor siluas meliusque alterna ualet res.*

191—4 (194—7).

prohibent flammae custodiaque ignis
Illi operum est arcent aditus diuinaque rerum
Vt maior species etne succurrat inanis
Cura sine arbitrio est.

195 *opertum* Rehd. *dictis* Rehd. perhaps for *adytis.* 196 occurs twice in the MSS, here, and again between 185 *Pars igni domitae pars ignes ferre coactae* and 187 *Haec illi sedes t. area rerum.* There it cannot be right: but in the passage 191—4 (194—7) it admits of explanation.

Construct *operum* with *aditus*, write *arcens* for *arcent*, for *etne* or *ethne*, *et ne*.

custodiaque ignis
Illi operum est arcens aditus, diuinaque rerum,
Vt maior species et ne succurrat inanis,
Cura sine arbitrio est.

'it has a fire to guard it, keeping off all access to its workings; for the divine care that watches things, in order that its grandeur may be greater and that it may not come to the rescue inefficaciously, is without witness'.

species in reference to the dignity which belongs to the gods and makes their operations secret. Ibis 75 *Noxque tenebrarum specie metuenda tuarum*, the solemnity or pomp of darkness.

196 (199). *Pellitur exutae †glomeratur nimbus harenae.*

exutae CSH Rehd. Ar. *exustae* ed. Rom. 1473, *glomerantur* Rehd. perhaps *glomeranter* or *glomerator*.

Neither *exhaustae* nor *glomeratim* (both ascribed to the Gyraldinus) agrees with our MSS: *exutae*, as in Manil. IV. 531, represents *exustae* rather than *exhaustae*, and either *glomeranter* an adverb, like *properanter*, *praeproperanter*, *festinanter*, *amanter* &c., or *glomerator*, constructed with the genitive *harenae*, would be a closer approach to *glomeratur* of MSS.

230 (233).

quae certo sidera currant
Ordine quaeue suo errant incondita cura

so *C*, and also Rehd.

Perhaps *deerrent—guro* (*gyro* Schrader).

264 (267).

Horrea uti saturent tumeant et dolea musto
Plenaque desecto surgant fienilia campo

so *C*. *tundant* Rehd. *rudeant* Helmst. m. pr. *fenilia* Helmst. and the Paris excerpts, *reuilia* Rehd.

tumeant would be suspect, even if the other MSS presented no variant, as it introduces a very harsh change of nominative. Rehd. suggests *tendant* 'distend'. The variant *reuilia* for *fienilia* is also curious. The poet is speaking of farm *produce*,

corn, wine: would he add to those *hay*? I doubt it, and suggest that the true reading is *eruilia* 'vetch-racks'; the lexicons, it is true, do not give the word, but it would be formed from *eruum* as correctly as *fenile* from *fenum*.

280, 1 (283, 4).

seu terra minutis
Rara foraminibus neue in se abstrahat auras

So *C*: Rehd. for *in se* gives *ussę*.

The Gyraldinus is said to have had *tenues in se*, which is a good and plausible reading, yet, again, just such as a clever palaeographer might have invented *ex coniectura*. Looking merely at the word *neue* of *C* and Rehd., and comparing Catull. LXIII. 70 *neue amicta* for *niue amicta*, it would be no impossible hypothesis to emend *neue inse* or *neue iusse* into *niuis insese*: 'snow-draughts' = cold airs drawn from the snow which lies on the higher parts of Aetna.

303, 4 (306, 7).

Quod si forte mihi quaedam discordia tecum est
Principiis aliis credas consurgere uentos

†*entos* Rehd.: perhaps *ut intus*.

I doubt the ordinary correction of this passage *Principiisque*. The subject to *consurgere* is sufficiently clear, as in 298 (301) he has already written *Credendum est etiam uentorum existere causas*; hence *uentos* is at least not *necessary*: the stroke in Rehd. through the *u* of *uentos* seems to indicate something wrong; the introduction of a subordinate *ut* clause is like 511 (514) *si firma manet tibi fabula mendax, Materiam ut credas aliam fluere igne*: the meaning is, 'if you disagree with my view, and believe that there are *other* sources of internal winds': i.e. different from the source he has just been mentioning 300—302 (303—5).

334 (337).

Non illam †uidet Aetna nec ullo intercipit aestu

I do not accept Haupt's conj. *bibit*, and have already (XVI. p. 302) suggested that *uidet* may = 'has no eye for', 'takes no notice of' the cloud, which is unaffected by the agitation of

Aetna. But if any emendation is needed, *monet* is as near, if not nearer to *uidet* than *bibit*: $m = ui$, ou or $ov = d$.

345—7 (348—350).

Quod si fallor adest species tantusque ruinis
Impetus adtentos oculorum transfugit ictus
Nec leuitas tantos igitur ferit aura mouetque

So *C*: Rehd. gives *ui*, less well. The dative *ruinis* may, I think, be right after *impetus*. Of v. 347 (350) the following is a tentative correction and explanation, which I offer for what it is worth.

Nec leue id est: stantes igitur ferit aura mouetque

'and this is no slight argument: it follows (*igitur*) that while they are still (i.e. seem to be still), they are (really) struck and set in motion by a breeze': i.e. if the falling masses sometimes elude the sight, i.e. fall too quickly to be seen perfectly, it is equally possible that while they seem motionless they may be subjected to the action of a wind. *stantes* sc. *ruinas*, transference from 'falling masses' to 'masses ready to fall'.

352 (355).

The form which the corrupt word that ends this v. takes in Rehd. *aprendas* (apndas) rather confirms my former conj. p. 303 *apludas*. '*Apluda* spelt *ablunda* in the Liber Glossarum and Balliol Glossary' Nettleship, Contributions to Latin Lexicography, p. 237[1]. The presence of the *n* is very significant.

396 (399).

sed maxima causa mola acris (*molaris* cett)
Illius incendi lapis est si uindicat aetnam.

So *C*: Rehd. omits *est* and gives *sic* for *si*.

Between Jacob's *est: hic*, Munro's *est: is*, it is very difficult to choose. My feeling is rather in favour of the former: certainly it is a better explanation of the *sic* which is found not only in Rehd. but the Helmstadt and other MSS.

[1] In the Sangallen Glossary, edited by Prof. Minton Warren, the word has become *abunda*, i.e. a depravation of *ablunda*, which one MS of Placidus s.v. (8, 13) gives for *apluda*.

405—7 (408—410).

Sed simul atque hausit flammas non tutior hausti
Vlla domus seruans aciem duramque tenaci
Septa fide tutum est illi patientia uicto.

So *C*: *fides* Rehd., *fidest*: *ut tum* Munro.

Munro changed *tutum* to *ut tum*, a somewhat forced exclamation: Scaliger conj. *tanta est*, Jacob *tuta est*. A word which would suit *patientia* better is *bruta* 'insensate', 'brutish': unless indeed a neuter *brutum* 'an insensate thing' is possible. *duramque* if it is not *duransque*, as Wernsdorf prints, may be *diuumque* 'faithfulness of the gods' = divine faithfulness.

436 (439). The *insula Vulcani nomine sacra* is thus described by Strabo and Scymnus. Strab. 275 *ταύτης* (Lipara) *δὲ μεταξύ πώς ἐστι καὶ τῆς Σικελίας ἣν νῦν Ἱερὰν Ἡφαίστου καλοῦσι, πετρώδης πᾶσα καὶ ἔρημος καὶ διάπυρος· ἔχει δὲ ἀναπνοὰς τρεῖς ὡς ἂν ἐκ τριῶν κρατήρων.* Scymn. 255

ὧν (νήσων) ἐστὶν Ἱερὰ λεγομένη τις εὐλόγως,
καιόμενα φαίνεται γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῆς πυρὰ
ἀπὸ σταδίων εὔδηλα πᾶσι πλειόνων
καὶ διαπύρων εἰς ὕψος ἀναβολαὶ μύδρων
ἔργα τε σιδήρεός τε ῥαιστήρων κτύπος.

461 (464)—462 (465).

Tum pauidum fugere et sacris concedere rebus
Parere et tuto speculaberis omnia collis.

confugere Rehd. *Par erit e* Scaliger; perhaps *Par erit ex. colli* ed. Rom. 1473.

Confugere of Rehd. *may* be a mere mistaken iteration of *fugere*: but such mistakes are rarely found in this MS: hence it *may* be a real variant, namely *consurgere*, here constructed with a dative, as *adsurgo* in Verg. Ecl. VI. 65, 'rise in deference to divine workings'. Cf. *consurrectio*. Rehd. has *singulos* for *figulos* 511 (516).

Et I suppose more closely represents *ex* than *e*, as often in Manilius. It is noticeable that in 429 (432) *pinguiscat et ubere*, Rehd. gives *ex*. This, by the way, is a good passage to show

the relation of Rehd. to *C* on the one hand, and to the more deeply interpolated MSS on the other. The poet wrote *pingui scatet ubere*; this in *C* has become *pinguiscat et u.*, in Rehd. *pinguiscat ex u.*, in the more interpolated MSS *pinguiscat ab u.*

489, 490 (494, 5). These vv. are thus written in *C*

Sicut cum rapidum curuo mare cernulus aestu
Ac primum tenuis imas agit ulteriores.

Rehd. gives *curuum—tẽnulus—Ad*, and leaves a space between *tenuis* and *agit*. *simas* Jacob's *H*, Munro's δ.

The first thing that strikes a palaeographer here is the peculiar word *cernulus* (*ternulus*). This is a good Latin word; it is used by Vergil Aen. x. 894, according to Pal. corrected and Rom., and it occurs several times in glossaries. Possibly it is right in the vv. of the Aetna, *cernulus* agreeing with *amnis*, the lava-flood, 'dipping forward, as when the sea does so (dips) with the curve of the tide', or, if such a quasi-Homeric construction (cf. ὡς ὅτε without a verb) is rejected as improbable, *cernulus* may be a corruption of *cernulat*[1] (so Jacob) another form of *cernuat* (Nettleship, Contrib. to Latin Lexicography s. v.). In no case should it be altered into so commonplace a word as *cernimus* (Munro).

In 490 (495) I find it very difficult to believe that Lucilius, usually so careful in his rhythm, admitted *ulteriores* at the end of a verse. It is, I believe, corrupt; just as in the immediately following verse, *et succernens*, as a very inelegant dispondaeus, is equally open to suspicion. But *simas* of δ, or possibly *cymas*, has every mark of genuineness. It is a substantive, meaning, according to Rich, Companion, p. 603, 'an architectural moulding, hollow in its upper surface, but swelling below'. It is here transferred to the slight curve or undulation of a wave stirred, but not strongly, by the wind: the v. probably had a pause after *agit*.

Sicut cum rapidum curuo mare cernulat aestu
Ac primum tenuis simas agit.

[1] Phillipps Glossary 4626 has *cernulare sternere, cernulatus stratus, cernuare cadere, labi.*

502 (507).

Simethi of *C* assumes in Rehd. this strange form *Si uel uel su fumanti.* This is obviously a corruption of *Simaethi.* Ribbeck mentions *Sumoetia* as a v. l. for *Symaethia* in Aen. IX. 584.

504 (509).

Vicenos persaepe dies iacet obruta moles

dies C and all MSS. *pedes* D'Orville. Though this emendation is accepted by Wernsdorf, Munro, Bährens, I venture to doubt it. For it involves two suppositions, each of which is purely hypothetical: (1) that *pe* of *pedes might be* absorbed in the former *pe* of *persaepe*; (2) that *-des was* then changed into *dies.* This implies a sort of corruption in the text of the poem which can hardly be paralleled in it elsewhere, if we take *C* as representing its earliest and best condition. And the change is certainly not necessary: for the masses might quite as well be described as lying immovable for twenty days together as buried twenty feet in the ground. Further (and this is with me no inconsiderable argument), the change from *pedes* to *dies* is not one which could be called common or slight, *palaeographically*: *dies* interchanges with *fides, diem* with *fidem, decem*; I never remember to have seen *dies* take the place of *pedes.* Speaking generally, I believe I may say that the scholars of the present day are over-fond of this 'absorption of the same syllable' as a plausible explanation of MS errors, and a basis of emendation.

515, 6 (520, 1).

Nam uelut arguti natura est aeris et ignis
Cum domitum est

So *C*, and it may be, rightly: 'for such as is the quality of copper and fire, when copper has been fused', i.e. just as in these, when combined the one to fuse the other, the substance of the fused metal remains substantially unaltered. The difficulty lies in the use of *natura,* which here fluctuates between the sense of 'property' and 'quality' or 'nature'.

But *et igni* (Scal.) is scarcely possible: it would surely be *ab igni*. Our poet does not go out of his way to make an obscure point obscurer.

521—3 (526—8).

Quin †etiam externam multis color ipse refellit
Non odor aut lenitas: putris magis ille magisque
Vna operis facies, eadem perque omnia terra est.

So *C*, intelligibly, if for *etiam* a substantive agreeing with *externam* is substituted: this must be *speciem*. 'Moreover there are many for whom the colour alone (of the lava-stone) is enough to disprove an external look (of similarity to other stones), and who need not smell or lightness to convince them: the lava-stone is more crumbling, more of one appearance as an effect of nature, a uniform kind of earth throughout.'

551, 2 (556, 7) is thus written in *C*

tantis fornacibus Aetna
Vritur †ac sacro nunquam †nec fertilis igni.

a Rehd. and other MSS.

ac is as purposeless here as *et* (if *igni* is read) in 515 (520): I suspect a corruption, perhaps *arcano* 'secret', 'hidden': so *hausta fontis arcani aqua* Tac. Ann. II. 54. For *nec* I have already suggested *haec non* (J. of Philol. XVI. p. 310).

561, 2 (566, 7).

Terra foraminibus uires trahit urguet in artum
Spiritus incendi †uiuit per maxima saxa.

uincuntur Haupt, *uis it* Munro, *uia fit* Bährens, *uis uincit m. s.* Wagler.

Possibly *fluor* or *furor it*.

579, 580 (585, 6).

Tu quoque Athenarum carmen tam nobile sidus
Erigone sedes uestra est phylomella canoris
Euocat in siluis.

So *C*; for *est phylomella* Rehd. gives *emphiloma*, others

amphilonia, amphiona. The *m* appears too constantly to be set aside. Hence possibly

Tu quoque Athenarum carmen tam nobile sidus
Erigone: uestrum scelus en Philomela canoris
Plorat Ityn siluis.

uestrum sc. *o Athenae.* *scelus* would be in apposition either with the single word *Philomela*, or with the whole sentence: 'your crime, O Athens, it is that Philomela wails for Itys in the ringing woods.' *Plorat Ityn* I have already conjectured u. s. p. 311.

593 (598) is thus written in *C*

Et iam †illa manus operum turbaeque moranter.

tubeque Rehd. *morantur* Jacob.

Haupt changed *illa* to *mille,* Munro added *Haec* before *et*; he also constructed *que* with *operum.* This position of *que* after the second word in the sentence, though defended by Munro, is to my mind very objectionable: *tubeque* too of Rehd. seems to point to a different reading from *turbe.* This might be *tabulae* 'pictures', of which the poet is here speaking. I see no reason to doubt *manus operum,* specimens of hand-craft exhibited in works of art; an expression modelled on Vergil's *Artificumque mānus inter se operumque laborem.*

595, 6, 7 (600, 1, 2).

Artificis naturae ingens opus aspice: nulla
†Cum tanta humanis †phoebus spectacula cernes,
Praecipueque uigil feruens ubi Sirius ardet.

The substitution of *rebus* for *phoebus* is palaeographically very doubtful. May not a better light be drawn from the reading of Rehd. 60 *plebeis*? If we write

nulla
Tu tanta humanae plebis spectacula cernes

we get an excellent sense: no work of this crowded world of men can compare with the workings of nature. For, in spite of Le Clerc who quotes in support of 602 Plin. H. N. II. 107 *feruent maria exoriente eo, fluctuant in cellis uina,*

mouentur stagna, a very indirect statement as far as *Aetna* is affected, or indeed *any* volcano, by Sirius: it seems more than probable that Bährens was right in believing 602 to be corrupt. Bährens conj.

Praecipueque nigil rupes ubi Trinacris ardet,

wide enough of the MSS., which seem to agree with *C*, except that for *ardet* they have *ardens*. But I incline to think *nigil* (in itself defensible, if constructed with *cernes*) an early mistake for *ingis*, and propose to alter the rest of the v. thus—*feruens ubi Sicanis*[1] *arx est*, 'and most of all on the ridges of the burning Sicanian height', i.e. where volcanic Aetna towers aloft. At any rate neither Munro nor any commentator whom I have seen gives any sufficient reason for believing that Aetna may be expected to be more active in the height of summer.

Before leaving this interesting passage, I would observe that the rare elision *Artificis naturae ingens* might seem to support *sopito* for *sopitae* or *sopita est* of MSS. in vv. 475, 6.

Tum si quis lapidum summo pertabuit igni
Asperior sopito et quaedam sordida faex est.

sopito sc. *lapidi*: if any stone has liquefied at the top (*summo*), when extinguished it exhibits a jagged surface of dirty-looking scoriae. Or should we read *falx*? The Cambridge MS. *C* it is true has *faex*: but all other MSS. give *fax* or *fas*. *Falx* would mean a notched or jagged surface such as the sickle figured in Rich p. 273 presents.

599, 600 (604, 5).

Insequitur miranda tamen sua fabula montem
Nec minus ille suo quamquam sors nobilis ignis.

quamquam sons (Heinsius), *nobilis ignis*[t] Munro. *quam quo sons, n. ignis* Bährens.

[1] A MS of the *Ibis* which I discovered in August, 1891, in the Museum of Linz, near Vienna, gives v. 598 *Plurima qua flammas Lictanis ethna mouet*. Here *Sicanis* has become *Lictanis*, a form almost as remote from the original as *Sirius* in Aetn. 602.

Possibly

Nec minus ille suo quam sons, tam n. igni.

Nec minus, equally with other mountains, is of course quite unconnected in construction with *quam*, which simply answers to *tam*.

623 (628).

Eheu defessos posuisse in limine membra.

So Munro, after *C.* Rehd. gives *Seu iam*, which would represent *Ceu iam*. Is not *eheu* here weak? Yet *iam* has a look of interpolation.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ADDENDUM.

With v. 23 as above emended cf. Quintil. Declam. IX. 8 *quidquid historiae tradiderunt, carmina finxerunt, fabulae adiecerunt, sub hac comparatione taceant.*

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE ILIAD. II.

Since the publication of my previous paper (*Journ. Phil.* xviii. 181 ff.) I have been able to make a beginning of carrying out the systematic examination of all MSS. of the Iliad which, as I there shewed, was a necessary preliminary to any attempted apparatus criticus. The liberality of the University of Oxford has now rendered a really comprehensive review of all the libraries of Europe a possibility, and it is satisfactory to think that in the competent hands of Mr T. W. Allen the work is certain to be adequately done. Till his labours are complete we must wait. But in the meantime it may be worth while to publish the few results at which I have myself arrived, as they are of considerable importance to the general question.

The first thing was to make a fairly complete collection of all the passages in the Iliad where there was evidence of an ancient variant in the scholia or Eustathius. Variants which could be explained from itacism, or any of the regular sources of error, variants consisting in the addition or omission of the augment, variations between the common particles τε δέ γε and any in fact which can hardly be considered capable of bearing evidence as to the ancient condition of the text, have in general been excluded. Nor again has any notice been taken of variants which are already represented by more than one or two MSS. Even with these considerable deductions, there are left some 2000 passages for comparison; a number which seems amply sufficient for gaining a preliminary idea of the general character of a MS., as the words to be collated are scattered with fair equality over all the books. The list is in fact not made out by a very rigorous adherence to any rule, but is simply a selection of points which seemed most likely to afford an

answer to the following questions; 1. Does a MS. shew any originality, or decided tendency to depart from the vulgate? 2. If so, what is likely to be the importance of its variants?

The answer to the first question is given by the number of peculiar variants which the MS. shews in these 2000 passages; the answer to the second by the character of the variants as compared with the statements of the authorities by whom they are mentioned; for instance, the MS. which contains most variants adopted or approved by Aristarchos will be the most valuable when we come to find readings in it which differ from the vulgate but are not found in any other source.

It will be distinctly understood that the discovery of such entirely new readings is the object of collation, but not of the present review, which is expressly confined to passages where the variants are already known, but not, as a rule, from MSS. hitherto collated. The intention is simply to obtain a rough measure by which it may be possible to select MSS. which deserve collation. Very few of those which exist seem to merit the enormous labour of full examination; but experience shews that by means of this selected list a quite sufficient idea can be formed of the character of a MS. in from 6 to 12 hours work.

With this list I have now examined 20 complete or nearly complete, and 6 fragmentary MSS., all those in fact which exist in the library of the British Museum and in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. I give a brief summary of results.

For the sake of comparison, these are classed as in the former paper. (1 A) indicates readings adopted by Aristarchos (Ar.) Zenodotos (Zen.) or Aristophanes (Aph.); (1 B) readings mentioned by Did. or Aristonikos; (2) readings attested by inferior authority. For comparison also, readings are regarded as peculiar which are not found in La Roche's collation of ACDGHLS, even though they may appear in partially collated MSS.

British Museum.

For these MSS. reference may be made to Mr E. M. Thompson's list in *Class. Rev.* ii. p. 102. Of his nos. 1—4 I have taken no notice; of the papyri and the Syrian palimpsest because

they are already well enough known, and of the tiny fragment 4 (Egerton 267) because it contains no variant of importance.

5. Burney 86. The *Townleianus.*

This contains peculiar readings,

(1 A) E 547 (Zen.); E 860 ὅσσον δ' (Aph.); Θ 290 (Zen. Aph.); K 161 δέ τε (Ar.; so also Vr. b); K 538 μετὰ φρεσίν (Ar.); Λ 184 δ' ἀστεροπήν (Ar.): M 44 ἀντίον (Ar.): M 246 ὑπ' (Zen.): N 384 ἦλθ' ἐπαμύντωρ (Ar.): N 732 (Aph.): P 173 σε (Zen.): Σ 34 (Ar.): Ω 241 ὀνόσασθ' (Ar.).

(Note: where the reading is not given, it will be found in La Roche. The remainder are previously unpublished.)

(1 B) Λ 128 φύγεν: Λ 537 ὀπισσώτρων: M 211 ἐνιπλήσσεις: Σ 124 ἄδινά: Ψ 374 ἀφ' ἁλός (*al.* πλείους, Did.).

(2) I 660 ἐκέλευε (Eust.): K 452 τυπείς (A *suprascr.*): Λ 27: Λ 568: Λ 770 καλλιγύναικα (ἐν ἄλλῳ, A): M 179 θυμῷ (ἐν ἄλλῳ, A): N 362 ἐπάλμενος (ἐν ἄλλῳ, A): Ξ 119: O 176 κέλευε (not κέλευσε: γρ. A): O 621: P 748 τετυχηώς (Herakl.): Σ 481 ἐπ' αὐτῷ (Eust.): T 194 δῶρα δ' (Eust. and so Syr.): T 316 κλισίῃσι (Eust.): Υ 256 ἀποστρέψεις (γρ. A: so Cant. Vat. Mosc. 2): Ψ 593 ἐπαιτήσειας (Eust.): Ψ 623 ὀπάζει (γρ. A): Ψ 639 βαλόντε (Schol. E 856): Ψ 815: Ω 48 ὀδυρόμενος (γρ. A): Ω 524 τ' ἄνυσις (ἐν ἄλλῳ A): Ω 599: Ω 785 ῥοδοδάκτυλος (γρ. A: so also Vrat. A.).

This gives us then for T

(1 A) 13: (1 B) 5: (2) 22: total 40.

A reference to Vol. xviii. p. 201 will shew that T thus stands above CDGHS, but not much. It is still far inferior to L, but quite worth collation.

6. Harley 5693.

This is Heyne's and La Roche's "Harl." For its history see *Class. Rev.* iii. p. 295. Peculiar readings:

1 A. Σ 506 (Ar.: and Vr. A). X 109 (Ar. διχῶς: and Mosc. 2).

1 B. P 250. T 386 αὖτε (La R. gives both this and εὖτε as the reading of Townl.: only the latter is right). Ψ 374 ἀφ' ἁλός (and T).

2. I 153 κέαται (and H^2): O 88 (v. Schol. B: also Lips.

fr. Mosc.): O 510 *αὐτοσχεδίην* (v. Sch. B): Π 260 *ἐριδμαίνουσιν* (Eust.): P 449 *οὐδέ τις ἄλλος* (*τινές*, Sch. T): Σ 273: Υ 454 (and Vr. b, a, Mosc. 2): Υ 496 *ἐυτροχάλῳ* (and Syr., Vr. b): (Φ 394 *κυνόμυια* has no MS. testimony in La R. but is in fact a vulgate reading. The same may be said of Φ 414 *ἀρήγεις*, Φ 416 *φιλομμειδής*): Φ 493 *ἔπειτα*: X 18 *ἀφείλαο* (and Ambr.; this is no doubt the variant alluded to in Sch. T, *τὸ ἀφείλεο διὰ τοῦ εο γράφεται*): Ω 48 *ὀδυρόμενος*.

Result: (1 A) 2; (1 B) 3; (2) 10; total 15.

This shews that Harl. 5693 is, next to C, the most consistent representative of the Vulgate known. In the first 14 books it has no single peculiar reading.

It may be noted that the similarity to M is much closer than would appear from La R.'s apparatus. There is hardly any, if any, variation, so far as La R.'s collation of M goes.

Though further collation of the text of Harl. 5693 seems to be quite useless, it may be pointed out that the MS. has a number of marginal variants of considerable interest; and further that the readings given by La R. (after Heyne) are in so large a proportion of cases inaccurate as to be perfectly worthless.

7. King's 16.

(1 A) A 598 *οἰνοχόει* (Ar. al.): Z 54 *ἀντίον* (Zen.; Vr. b): Ξ 236 *ἐπ'* (Zen.): O 197 *βέλτερον* (Ar.): Π 522 *οὖ παιδός* (Ar.): Π 810 *τότε* (Ar.).

(1 B) M 211 *ἐνιπλήσσεις* (Did.; and T).

(2) H 427 *ἀλλά*: I 187 *ἀργύρεος ζυγός*: I 243 *ἀτυζομένους*: M 135 *τοί*: O 510 *αὐτοσχεδίην* (and Harl.): P 178 *ἐποτρύνῃσι μάχεσθαι*: (Φ 394 *κυνόμυια*, see above): K 328 *ἀπὸ σφάραγον*.

Result: (1 A) 6; (1 B) 1; (2) 7; total 14.

This is a most inferior MS., riddled with itacism, and with an unusual number of lines omitted. There are some curious instances of conflate readings; e.g. Ξ 310 *κατόσεαι* is a mixture of *χολώσεαι* and *κοτέσσεαι*: Φ 122 *ὠτειλὴν σὴν* is from *ὠτειλὴν* with *σ* written over *ν* (*ὠτειλῆς*): Λ 691 *ἔκτανθεν* is a mixture of *ἔκτανεν* and *ἔκταθεν*.

8. Harley 5600.

This MS. was written by Rhosos in Florence in 1466. He had two MSS. before him, of which one was T. In the first 12 books he seems to have made an eclectic text, embodying many readings of T. In the last 12 he probably got tired of doing this and has written readings from T in the margin. In so doing he often follows the grossest errors of T, e.g. M 285 *γρ. προσπελάζον*, P 451 *γρ. βαλῶ*, etc. It follows that only those readings can be counted which are not found in T.

(1 A) Z 288 *ἡ δ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα παρίστατο φωριαμοῖσιν* (Ar. *διχῶς*: so Ambr.): Λ 230 *ἰὼν* (Ar. *διχῶς*: so also AH *suprascr.*): M 283 *λωτοῦντα* (Ar.): O 197 *βέλτερον* (Ar.: also King's 16): Σ 400 *πάντα* (Zen. Aph.; so also Bar.); Σ 424 *Θέτις* (Zen.; but 385 *Θέτι*); Ψ 198 *τε σεύαιτο* (Ar.; so Flor.).

(1 B) I 399 *γήμαντα* (Did.; so Mor. and others): Υ 385 *Ὕλης* (Did.; and Vr. A).

(2) B 850 *αἴης* (Eust.): N 27 *αὐτῷ* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ* A; so Flor. Rom.): P 502 *μετάφρενον* (Eust.; and H^2): T 136 *τήν* (Eust.; Vr. A): (Φ 394 *κυνόμυια*): Φ 493 *ἔπειτα* (Harl. &c.).

Result; (1 A) 6; (1 B) 2; (2) 5; total 13.

The MS. hardly needs further attention. It is not unlikely that Rhosos' other archetype was the foundation of the Florentine edition. If this archetype could be found, it might be interesting, as the readings in Z 288, Σ 400, Ψ 198, I 399, B 850, N 27 seem to point to an original source. I have also noted one reading not on my list, P 368 *μάχης ἐπί θ' ὅσσον*, which is also that of Harl. 5693. This seems to be the first published MS. evidence for a reading generally adopted on conjecture. "MSS. *ὅσσοι*" La R. But Heyne wrongly gives *ὅσσοι* as the reading of Harl.

9. Harley 1771.

(1 A) B 53 *βουλή* (Ar.): B 133 *Ἴλιον* (Ar.): Δ 142 *ἵππῳ* (Aph.?): Z 479 *γ' ὅδε* (Ar.): I 612 *ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν* (Ar.): M 44 *ἀντίον* (Ar. and T): N 384 *ἦλθ' ἐπαμύντωρ* (Ar. and T): Ξ 505 *ἐν* (Zen., Aph.): Σ 506 *ἀμοιβηδόν* (Ar. and Harl. Vr. A): T 189 *τέως*, om. *περ.* (Ar.? and Ven. B): X 475 *ἔμπνυτο* (Ar.): Ψ 701 *παλαιμοσύνης* (Ar.): Ω 110 *προιάπτω* (Zen., Ar. and so Mor. Vr. A Mosc. 2).

(1 B). Δ 148 *ῥίγησέν τ' ἄρ'* (Did. and NO): I 399 *γήμαντα* (Did., Mor. and others): I 584 *κασίγνητοι* (Did.): M 30 *ἐποιησαν* (Did. and Vr. b).

(2) B 766 *πηρείῃ* (Eust. al.): Z 55 *αὔτως* (E): I 463 *στροφάασθαι* (Eust.): I 562 *αὐτῇ* (Eust.): K 323 *ποδώκεα* (*γρ.* A): Λ 400 *ὠκέας ἵππους* (*γρ.* A): Λ 568 *φεύγων* (Eust. and T): Λ 770 *καλλιγύναικα* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ* A and T): Λ 788 *ἐπακοῦσαι* (Eust.): M 62 *ἐλαύνετε μώνυχας* (Eust.): M 179 *θυμῷ* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ* A; and T): (in Ξ 101 *ἀποπαπτανέουσι* with L): Ξ 256 *ἀνεγρόμενος* (Eust.): Ξ 474 *ἔοικεν* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ*, A): O 206 *νημερτές* (Eust.): O 330 *καρτεροθύμων* (*γρ.* A, and Vr. b, frag. Mosc.): O 348 *ἐθέλοντα*, glossed *πολεμεῖν* (Rhet. Gr. al.): O 409 *ἠδὲ* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ* A; and G ?): O 639 *ἀέθλων* (Eust., A marg., Harl., Vr. d.): Π 151 *Ἠριδανοῖο* (Eust.): P 265 *ἠιόνος* (Eust.): P 748 *τετυχηώς* (Herakl. and T): Σ 481 *ἐπ'* (Eust. and T): T 136 *τὴν* (Eust. and Vr. A, Harl. 5600): T 194 *δῶρα δ'* (Eust. and Syr., T): T 316 *κλισίῃσι* (Eust. and T): Υ 454 *αὖ τοὺς ἄλλους* (*γρ.* A, and Harl. al.): Υ 496 *εὐτροχάλῳ* (*γρ.* A, and Harl., Syr., Vr. b): Φ 33 *κατακτάμεναι* (*γρ.* A): Φ 67 *ἀνέσχεθε* (Eust. and Vr. b, Mosc. 2): (Φ 394 *κυνόμυια*: Φ 414 *ἀρήγεις*, Φ 416 *φιλομμειδής*, see under Harl. 5693): Φ 493 *ἔπειτα* (*γρ.* A, and Harl. 5600, 5693): X 49 *στρατόν* (Eust.): X 100 *πρῶτον* (Eust.): Ψ 319 *πέποιθε* (Eust.): Ψ 593 *ἀπαιτήσειας* (Eust. and T): Ω 48 *ὀδυρόμενος* (Eust. and T. Harl.): Ω 238 *ἀνέεργεν* (Eust.): Ω 367 *ἔχοντα* (Eust. and Vr. d): Ω 413 *οὕτως* (Eust. and Vr. d): (and *ἥδε*): Ω 556 *φέρομαι* (Eust. and Mor.): Ω 599 *ἐκέλευσας* (*γρ.* A; and T).

Result: (1 A) 13; (1 B) 4; (2) 40; total 57.

This late (XV cent.) MS is at first sight most unpromising. It has apparently been used as a school-book. It is crowded, especially at the beginning, with glosses and rhetorical scholia of the silliest sort. These fortunately become rarer as they go on; but *ὣς φάτο* is glossed *οὕτως ἔφη* to the bitter end. Yet the MS. is undoubtedly, for the text of the Iliad, the most valuable of all in the British Museum; for it seems to represent a new family.

This is shewn by the readings under (2), which are more numerous than in L itself. 25 of these are given by Eustathios,

11 are variants in A, 19 of them have hitherto been without MS. authority. It is evident that we have here the only known representative of a family which was familiar both to Eustathios and to the scribe who inserted the variants in A.

It is clear that this family was not one of the best, for the number of readings under (1 A) and (1 B) is only a fraction of those in L, and is almost identical with that of T. The latter MS., it may be noticed, seems itself to have been to some extent influenced by this family; in a good many cases under (2) it is the only known MS which agrees in giving a reading of Eustathios.

A suspicion might arise that these Eustathian readings have been introduced by a scribe who took them from the Bishop's commentary. This however is inconsistent with the fact that in some cases the readings given are emphatically disapproved by Eust.; e.g. M 62 *ἐλαύνομεν ὠκέας ἵππους, ἢ κατά τινας, οὐ μέντοι καλῶς, ἐλαύνετε μώνυχας ἵππους.* So too in K 268 *Σκανδείᾳ*, the reading of the MS., is ascribed to *τινὰ τῶν νεωτέρων ἀντιγράφων καὶ οὐ πάνυ ἀκριβῶν.* The extraordinary *Ἠριδανοῖο* in Π 151 is attributed to *πολλὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων.*

There are many marginal variants, generally giving the vulgate where the text departs from it. One of these presents a curious problem: Γ 434 *Ἀρίσταρχος παύεσθαι· ἄλλοι δὲ παύσασθαι.* This is a genuine bit of Didymos; how came it here? It is not in Schol. B, Schol. T, the Scholia Minora, or Eustathios. Had the scribe access to A? Or was there still in the XVth cent. another MS. extant with Didymean scholia?

Of course our first task is to search for older MSS. of this family. Failing these, this MS. must be collated.

10. Harley 5672.

This fragmentary MS., containing parts of Il. i—iv, shews no variant of any interest. It has not been previously remarked that it is in the handwriting of Rhosos. But it shews no other affinity with Harl. 5600.

11. Harley 5601.

Result: (1 A) 3; (1 B) 5; (2) 13; total 21.

This result, though small, really overrates the value of the MS.; as all the variants under (1 A) are of the slightest kind,

and a considerable proportion of the rest are really common variants, though not quoted by La Roche from ACDGHLS. 5 of those given under (2) are common enough to have got into the first Aldine edition.

There are however one or two readings found also in A, but not of the common type, which deserve notice; e.g. *μέσῳ* Ξ 223, *μεγαθύμῳ* Πηλείωνι P 214. These obviously would not justify any expense of time in collation.

12 (Harl. 1675) and 13 (Add. 8232) are quite unworthy of notice.

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

1. Grec 2680 (La R. *H. T.*, p. 476, no. 104).

"Codex chartaceus, olim Medicaeus, quo continentur Homeri Ilias et Odyssea. Accesserunt glossae et scholia non magni pretii, nec ubique, sed sparsim...Is codex saeculo decimo quinto exeunte videtur exaratus."

Result: (1 A) 9; (1 B) 3; (2) 6; total 18.

Some of these readings are curious; e.g. Λ 101 *βῆ Ἴσον*. In Π 151 *ἣ ἠριδανοῖο* is interlined over *ὠκεανοῖο*. The MS. is closely related to Harl. 5600; e.g. they share the impossible *πρῶτον ἐμιγέσθην*, Ξ 295; *ὑπισχνόμενοι*, I 576; *δεπάεσσιν* O 86. They are both descended from an archetype which contained an unusual proportion of Aristarchean readings. But in their present state of degeneracy they are not worth labour.

(2) Grec 2681 (La R. *H. T.*, p. 470, no. 81).

"Codex bombycinus olim Medicaeus...saeculo decimo tertio exaratus videtur." This is absurd. The MS. itself is dated 5938 which cannot be right; A.M. 6938 = A.D. 1429 would probably not be far from the mark.

The MS. proper (bombycinus) is fragmentary, containing A 374—B 153, Δ 20—Σ 491, Σ 613—Φ 97, Φ 157—X 23, Ψ 319—Ω. The gaps are filled up on sheets of different paper (chartaceus), with the exception of Φ 98—156, for which a sheet has been inserted but left blank.

Result: (1 A) 8; (1 B) 4; (2) 9; total 21.

But most of these variants are known from other MSS., though not quoted from those chosen for comparison. The MS. may be neglected.

(3) Grec 2682 (La R. *H. T.*, p. 471, no. 82).

XIV cent. with commentary of Porphyrogenitus. The handwriting appears to be the same as that of Harl. 5693. I have to thank M. Henri Omont for giving me a photograph of one page for comparison.

(1 A) A 609 *ὅ* m. 1 (Zen.); Γ 280 *μάρτυρές* (Zen.); I 89 *ἀριστῆας* (*ἀριστέας* Ar.); M 465 *ἐρύκακεν* (Ar.); T 345 *ἐῆο* (= *ἑοῖο*, Zen.); Ψ 753 *πειρήσεσθον* (Zen.); Ω 20 *αἰγίδα*, 21 *χρυσείην* (Ar.).

(1 B) Θ 137 *φοινικόεντα* (Did.); Π 365 *λαίλαπι* (*ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι*, Did.); [Φ 252 *μελανόστου*, as Aristotle; but only a difference of accent].

(2) A 207 *τεόν* (Eust.); E 749 *αὐτόματοι* (Eust.); Π 351 *ἕκαστον* (Eust. and Syr.); P 724 *ἅραντας* (Et. Mag.); Ω 165 *φίλῃσιν* (*γρ.* A).

Result: (1 A) 7; (1 B) 2; (2) 5; total 14.

The quality of these is good, for they are almost all real peculiarities, and seem to point to an independent ancestor; but their number is too small to give any encouragement.

(4) Grec 2683 (La R. *H. T.* p. 471 no. 83). Bomb. saec. XIV. Contains a number of Porphyrian scholia.

Result: (1 A) 7; (1 B) 5; (2) 11; total 23.

But almost all have already been found in the preceding MSS., so I do not repeat them. The only novelties are A 204 *τελέεσθαι* (Ar.); Ω 293 *οὗ* (Zen.); Ω 518 *πολλὰ ἀνάσχεο* (a very good reading, and implied by Did. *οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος κάκ' ἄνσχεο*: the frequent *κάκ' ἀνάσχεο* is a contamination); P 650 *πᾶσι* (so quoted by Plutarch).

(5) Grec 2684.

"Codex bombycinus, olim Germani Brixii, postea Colbertinus, quo continetur Homeri Ilias una cum paraphrasi in libros quatuor priores et initium quinti. Occurrunt etiam scholia quaedam, nec illa magni momenti. Is codex saeculo decimo quarto exaratus videtur." La Roche's description (*H. T.* p. 471,

no. 84) is wrong. The first 14 folios, A 1—583, are lost and supplied by another hand.

Result: (1 A) 7; (1 B) 4; (2) 12; total 23.

There are a few novelties; Δ 493 ἔκφυγε (Eust.); I 322 πολεμίζων, evidently the variant alluded to by Did.; I 681 σόως (Ar. σόῳς, διχῶς); Λ 339 οὐδὲ γάρ οἱ, contaminated from vulg. οὐ γάρ οἱ and Ar.'s οὐδὲ γάρ; N 318 κείνω, possibly the variant alluded to by Did.; P 27 τε for ἑ (Ar.); Σ 171 Πατρόκλου (Ar.).

(6) Grec 2685 (La R. *H. T.* p. 471, no. 85).

Result: (1 A) 4; (1 B) 4; (2) 16; total 24.

The notable readings are A 137 δώσουσι (Eust.); E 89 ἐερμέναι (Ar.); I 328 δὲ ξὺν (Sch. A); M 159 ῥέεν (Did.). The MS. is a good vulgate, very accurately written in a fine bold hand. It seems nearly related to frag. Mosc.

(7) Grec 2686 (La R. *H. T.* p. 471, no. 86).

This contains only A—M. I went through several books but found them so full of gross blunders that any enumeration of "readings" would be worthless.

(8) Grec 2687 (La R. *H. T.* p. 471, no. 87).

Contains only A—H 294 (not A—I as Catalogue). It has no reading worth noting.

(9) Grec 2697 (not in La R.).

"Codex membranaceus, quo continetur Eustathii commentarius in Iliadis libros duodecim priores. Accedit textus... Is codex saeculo decimo tertio exaratus videtur."

I is in another hand; it has Scholia, but not Eustathios.

Result: (1 A) 4; (1 B) 1; (2) 5; total 10.

Novelties; A 309 ἐν (Ar.); Γ 51 κατηφείη (Zen.); Δ 170 πότμον (γρ. μοῖραν, marg.) (Ar.); Δ 321 ὀπάζει (γρ. ἱκάνει, marg.) (Ar.); E 31 τειχεσιβλῆτα (supr. πλῆτα Zen.).

(10) Grec 2766 (La R. *H. T.* p. 471, no. 86).

Some reward at last for this weary search. The MS. was bought at Constantinople; an inscription at the end says that it belonged to Solomon, Patriarch of Jerusalem. It is ascribed to the XIIIth century. I thought this was too early, and on referring it to M. Omont found that his opinion was in favour of the XIVth. Among scribblings at the end is μαξίμω, the

same name, and so far as one's memory can be trusted in such a matter, in the same handwriting, as at the end of the Harley Odyssey.

This MS. presents hardly any peculiarities, for the important reason that it is almost identical with L. I strongly suspect that a comparison of the two will shew that it is the original from which L was copied. It has for instance in Φ 213 the correct reading *ἐκφθέγξατο* for L's *ἐκφέγξατο*. If this is so, we may be content with a minute collation of this MS. and trouble about L no more. The following new variants may probably exist in L but are not recorded by La Roche. E 725 *ὀπίσσωτρα* (*ἐ* supr.); E 839 *ἄνδρα δ'* (Ar.); E 479 *εἶποι* (*εἶπη* L) (A supraser.); H 436 *ἐν πεδίῳ* (Aph.; *κεχωρισμένον ἐν τῇ γῇ*, Paraphr.); I 109 *ἀπομυθεόμην*; I 328 *δὲ σύν*; I 349 *ὑπ' αὐτῷ*; I 446 *ἠβάοντα*; I 514 *φρένας* (Eust.); I 582 *οὐδοῦ ὑπερβεβαώς*; I 700 *ἀνῆκας*; (I 703 the vulgate *στηθεσσιν ἀνώγοι* for *στήθεσσι κελεύοι* of L); Λ 539 *δουρί* (Ar.); (M 433 marg. *γρ. καὶ χερνῆτις ἀλῆτις*); Π 365 *εὐδιής*, marg. *ἐκ δίης*; P 397 *παρόψιον* (supr. *ν*); Ψ 424 *παρεκκλίνας*; Ψ 464 *παπταίνεται* (Ar.); Ω 550 *ἑοῖο* (Zen. cf. Pap. marg. *τεοιο*).

This gleaning promises well for the future.

(11) Grec 2767 (La R. *H. T.* p. 471, no. 89).

A 1—119, 202—234, Ω 674—end are missing.

Result: (1 A) 14; (1 B) 4; (2) 27; total 45.

This is a very good list, especially as it includes a large proportion of novelties. Δ 129 *οἱ* (Did.); Δ 490 *δουρὶ φαεινῷ* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ* A): E 374 *ἐνιπῇ* (*τινές*, Sch. T); Z 290 *ἅς* (Strabo, and Ambr.); Z 356 *ἀρχῆς* (Zen.); H 74 *εἴ κέν τινα* (*γρ. εἰ καί τινα*, A); H 130 *βαρείας* (*ἐν ταῖς ἐξητασμέναις Ἀριστάρχου*); H 336 *τ'* (Ar.); H 452 *τὸ* for *τό τ'* (Ar.); I 155 *τιμήσονται* (but *τιμήσωσι*, *ου* supraser., 297) (Ar.); I 372 *οὐκ* (Eust.); I 514 *φρένας* (Eust.); I 703 *ὀρίνει* (supr. *η*) (Eust.); K 457 *φθεγγομένη* (Aristotle); N 374 *αἰνίξομ'* (Did.); N 551 *παρασταδόν* (Zen. Aph.); Ξ 163 *ὅππως* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ ὅπως*, A); P 178 *ἐποτρύνησι μάχεσθαι* (Eust.); Ψ 300 *τόθ'* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ*, A); Ω 310 *ἑὸν* (m. 1? erased) (*ἐν ἄλλῳ*, A).

This list of absolute novelties gives this MS. a very high place, and makes collation necessary. It may be noted that it

gives the excellent reading *αὐτός* for *αὐτούς* in Ω 499. This has hitherto been found only in MSS. of the L class; but the MS. shews only a few other L peculiarities, and if there is any kinship it must be very distant.

(12) Grec 2768 (La R. *H. T.* p. 472, no. 90).

Result: (1 A) 8; (1 B) 1; (2) 13; total 22.

Novelties; B 111 *μέγας* (Ar.); Γ 3 *οὐρανόθεν* (Apoll.); K 168 *τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ*, A); M 353 *δ' ἄρ' ἐπ'* (Eust.); Ξ 185 *λαμπρόν* (*ἐν ἄλλῳ*, A); Π 161 *λάμψαντες* (*λάψαντες*, Zen.); Π 636 om. *τ'* after *βοῶν* (Ar.?); Π 756 *δηριθήτην* (Eust.); X 473 *ἦσαν* (*γρ.* A); Ψ 414 *ἐφαμαρτεῖτον* (Ar. *διχῶς*).

Not enough to call for collation.

(13) Grec 2830 (La R. *H. T.* p. 472, no. 91) contains Il. Δ only and is not available for comparison.

(14) Grec 2894 (La R. *H. T.* p. 475, no. 103).

Result; (1 A) 6; (1 B) 2; (2) 7; total 15.

Novelty: Λ 325 *θηρευτῆρσι* (Ar.). This MS. can safely be neglected.

(15) Grec 1805 (La R. *H. T.* p. 470, no. 80).

(16) Supplément Grec 144 (not in La R.).

These MSS. are twins, and a most important pair, from which much information is to be got.

Both are written by George Gregoropulos, a scribe who worked chiefly, M. Omont tells me, in Venice, in the fifteenth century. The two are practically identical through the first nineteen books; a letter here and there differs by mistake, but they agree even in copying scholia as if they belonged to the text; a scholion on *ἄωρτο* for instance is written between Γ 272 and 273 as if it were a hexameter. So in N 389 both write *ἀχερωὶς λευκή*, thus turning the gloss *λεύκη* into an adjective. In some cases a correction or marginal note in 1805 appears in the text of S 144, but not, I think, *vice versa*. For instance we have in K 503, *κύντατον*, *γρ. κύντερον* in 1805, but *κύντερον* in the text of S 144: Λ 319 *βόλεται suprasc. ου* in 1805, *βούλεται* S 144: N 148 *πελεμίχθη*, *supr. ο*, 1805, *πολεμίχθη* S 144: Π 161 *λά///ψαντες p. ras.* 1805, *λάψαντες* S 144. The only real variation between the two is P 392 *θρέπτα* 1805, *θρέπτρα*

S 144[1]. In all the other cases the reading of S 144 may have come from 1805.

So far it would seem that S 144 was only a copy of 1805. But in Υ all changes. In Υ 385, 1805 has ὕλης, S 144 ὕδης, and from this point onwards the two MSS. continually differ, and at an increasing rate. In Φ they agree in 16 places and differ in 9; in X they agree in 2 and differ in 7; in Ψ they agree in 14 and differ in 15; in Ω they agree in 3 and differ in 27.

How then are we to account for the phenomena? We must first examine the character of the texts.

The last 12 books of S 144 shew a very marked affinity to the L type, containing some 43 readings hitherto peculiar to this class; whereas the first 12 books contain only 2. The last 5 books of 1805 contain 14 such, of which 13 are common to both, S 144 having 27 altogether. The L class has 91 peculiarities altogether (*Journ. Phil.* xviii. p. 201), of which 52 occur in the last 12 books.

It is clear therefore that for the last 12 books S 144 belongs to the L family; and that 1805 belongs to it from X to T, and is much influenced by it from Υ to Ω.

The explanation of this complicated series of facts would seem to be something as follows. S 144 and 1805 as far as T are derived, but not immediately copied, from an archetype of the L family which had lost the first 12 books and had them supplied from other sources. As L itself appeared to be copied from a MS. which had lost the first 6 books, we are led to conjecture that the archetype of both was the same, but that the loss had extended in the interval between the two copyings. Gregoropulos when writing 1805 probably had this archetype before him all the time, but when he got to Υ he must, for some unknown reason, have gone on to make a contaminated text from this and some other MS., not yet known. The full solution of the problem may possibly be within our reach. If he worked at Venice, it is quite possible that both his originals may still be there. If

[1] It will of course be understood that this and the following remarks refer only to the selected passages. A complete comparison of the texts will doubtless shew other differences.

they can only be identified, we shall have gained two things; in the first place the knowledge of a fresh and independent member of the L group for 12 books of the Iliad; in the second a most instructive example of the way in which such an independent family would be likely to gradually lose its individuality by the contamination of its younger members with the vulgate. For both these reasons it is heartily to be desired that Mr Allen may succeed in identifying these hypothetical ancestors in the libraries of Venice.

It is obviously useless to give a list of peculiar readings in a MS. so nearly identical. I mention two however as particularly instructive. In M 192 both have *οὐδας ἐρείσθη*, which gives an interesting illustration of the actual process of contamination; the peculiar *οὐδας ἔρεισε* of L has got half-way to the vulgate *οὔδει ἐρείσθη*. In M 318 both have *ἀκλεέες*. This remarkable reading cannot be due to the invention of a scribe, but must be a genuine old tradition. In my note on the passage I conjectured, though with considerable hesitation, that this was the reading which a corrupt scholion of Didymos meant to attribute to Aristarchos, and on this ground I introduced it into the text; but I little expected that any MS. tradition of such a reading had survived. Now that we know it as a fact, my conjecture as to the scholion of Aristarchos is decisively confirmed; for I have already pointed out how common it is to find an Aristarchean reading preserved by L alone. Here it is 1805 which has preserved a reading of the archetype which has been lost by L and Par. 2766.

(17) Supplément grec 497 (not in La R.).

Bombycinus, saec. xiii. It is in a very imperfect condition; the margins are all gone, and some of the text. Many leaves are missing, containing A 1—215, Γ 300—458, N 68—146, N 307—Ξ 112, Ξ 266—O 242, O 414—Π 318, Π 566—P 265, P 349—Υ 187, X 470—Ψ 35. The Catalogue is omitted in B and added at the end of the MS. in a later hand.

Result; (1 A) 6; (1 B) 5; (2) 19; total 30.

Among these are hardly any actual novelties; but I have not found elsewhere Γ 206 *σῆς* for *σεῦ* (Zen.); and a later hand has added one or two good variants, perhaps from Scholia;

N 198 *αἶγα* supr. ε, Υ 269 ἔλασσε supr. *θλα*. The MS. is of no practical importance.

The general result of this enquiry has been to convince me even more than before of the uniqueness of the L family. It may be mentioned by the way that it seems absurd to continue to speak of this as the "Leipzig group"; it might better be called the "Paris" group. For Leipzig contains only a fragment —less than one-third of a single member of it; whereas Paris has what is probably the best representative of the group in 2766, and two near relations in 1805 and S 144.

The more MSS. I have examined, the less hopeful I have grown of the possibility of dividing them up into well-marked genealogies. Readings which, while we are dealing with only a few MSS., seem to be peculiarities, begin, as soon as we extend our range, to reappear in distant regions in a sporadic manner which defies all attempts to trace any lineal descent. This is due no doubt to the habit of writing variants in the margin. A student will perhaps have compared his own MS. with another, and jotted down variants on a few books. Then comes another student or another MS. for collation, and fresh variants appear in the margins. The book thus annotated is copied by a scribe of doubtful erudition, who follows either accident or his taste in introducing the variants into his text. It is easy to see how soon any individuality is lost under this process, which went on for some hundreds of years. The only wonderful thing is that any family should have preserved such an individual character as the Paris group still maintains. This alone still retains a large number of peculiarities, even when all these fresh MSS. have been brought under review. Readings of C and D almost without exception are found in various other MSS. shewing no particular family resemblance; but peculiarities of L, though diminished in number, now surpass those of any other group in far greater proportion than I was able to present in the previous paper.

WALTER LEAF.

NOTES ON JUVENAL SATIRE VIII.

See Hall's Sat. III. This satire was translated by Stepney. The degeneracy of sons of great men is a very frequent theme with the ancients. See Ast's lexicon to Plato, s.v. *διδακτός*. Cic. Tusc. I §§ 81 82. The sons of Themistocles, Aristides, Pericles, Thucydides (Plat. Meno 93 94, and the whole of the Platonic tract on virtue 376—9), those of Cicero (Hier. ep. 54 § 4), Germanicus, M. Aurelius, Severus, are the typical examples of degeneracy (Spartian. Severus 20 21. AV. Caes. 3 § 5). I know no early authority for *heroum filii noxae*, *ἡρώων παῖδες λῷβαι*, *ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων τέκνα πήματα*, and other like proverbs admirably illustrated by Erasmus. Aristides II 214 Dind. says of Cimon, he gives no room for the reproach, *ὡς ἄρα τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ὥσπερ εἱμαρμένον εἴη τοὺς υἱεῖς φαύλους ἀποβαίνειν*, words ascribed to Demosthenes by the scholiast (III 530 Dind.). cf. Plut. Arat. 1 § 1. VM. III 5 'qui a parentibus claris degeneraverunt.' Ios. ant. VI 3 § 2 (sons of Samuel). Stob. flor. LXXXVII '*ὅτι οὐκ ἀεὶ τοῖς εὐγενέσι καὶ χρηστοῖς τῶν πατέρων ἔοικε τὰ τέκνα.*' Greg. Naz. carm. sect. 2 (moralia) n. 26 *εἰς εὐγενῆ δύστροπον* (II 540—2).

1 STEMMATA Sen. ep. 44 § 1 *si quid est aliud in philosophia boni, hoc est, quod* stemma *non inspicit.* Capitol. Albin. 12 § 8.

2 CENSERI LAUDE Sen. contr. 34 § 13 misericordia *semper* censi *sumus.* Iustin IX 2 § 9. Rossbach röm. Ehe 367.

3 4 STANTIS IN CURRIBUS AEMILIANOS ET CURIOS Prud. c. Symm. II 556—8 *frustra igitur currus summo miramur in arcu | quadriiugos* stantesque *duces* in curribus *altis | Fabricios,* Curios. Iustin XXIV 7 § 10 Brennus assures his troops

that the *statuae cum quadrigis, quarum ingens copia procul visebatur*, were of solid gold.

4 DIMIDIOS Luc. Demonax 53 *ἀνδριάντα ἰδὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκεκομμένον.*

9 SI CORAM LEPIDIS MALE VIVITUR Lact. v 9 § 8 *quin potius auferantur*, quibus coram male vivere *pudet.* cf. § 6 *an erubescunt* coram *iustis et bonis esse nequam?* cf. Tac. an. III 22 *at Romae* Lepida, *cui super* Aemiliorum *decus L. Sulla et Cn. Pompeius proavi erant, defertur simulavisse partum ex P. Quirinio divite atque orbo. adiciebantur adulteria, venena quaesitumque per Chaldaeos in domum Caesaris.* 23 *Lepida, ludorum diebus...theatrum cum claris feminis ingressa, lamentatione flebili maiores suos ciens ipsumque Pompeium, cuius ea monimenta et adstantes imagines visebantur, tantum misericordiae permovit* cet. One M. Aemilius Lepidus was deemed by Augustus worthy of supreme power (Tac. an. I 13), and retained the favour of Tiberius (*ibid.* cf. III 50 51. IV 20).

EFFIGIES QUO on the construction Haase (lat. Sprachwissenschaft II 105) cites Kempf on VM. IX 13 E 2. Jaeger on paneg. VIII 10 § 3. Arntzen on Dionys. Cato dist. IV 16 2. Add Varro sat. Men. 588 Bücheler. Aen. IV 98. Sen. ep. 7 § 4. n. q. III 18 § 2. paneg. IX 10. Quintil. decl. 12 § 3 pr. quo *nunc* tantum frumenti? quo classem *commeatu gravem?*

10 LUDITUR ALEA on the constr. see Ovid and Suet. in Krebs-Schmalz Antibarbarus s.v. *ludo*; and the *Anhang* (Frankf. a. M. 1862) of F. X. Allgayer p. 74.

ALEA PERNOX Capitolin. Ver. 5 § 7 *post convivium* lusum est tesseris usque ad lucem.

11 12 SI DORMIRE INCIPIS ORTU LUCIFERI, QUO SIGNA DUCES ET CASTRA MOVEBANT, Prudent. psychom. 316—8 (of Luxuria) *ac tunc* pervigilem *ructabat marcida* cenam: | sub lucem *quia forte iacens ad fercula raucos | audierat lituos.* Ov. P. I 5 45 46 *nec iuvat* in lucem *nimio marcescere vino,* | *nec tenet incertas alea blanda manus.* In a treatise 'of pleasure' ascribed to Chamaeleon of Pontus (Athen. 273^{e}) Smindyrides the Sybarite *οὐκ ἔφη τὸν ἥλιον ἐτῶν εἴκοσιν οὔτ' ἀνατέλλοντα οὔτε δυόμενον ἑωρακέναι. καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν αὐτῷ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν.* In a feast given by Gaius (Caligula) A.D. 39

(DCass. LIX 17 § 8) τό τε λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὴν νύκτα πᾶσαν εἰστιάθησαν. (§ 9) καὶ γὰρ τὴν νύκτα ἡμέραν, ὥσπερ που τὴν θάλασσαν γῆν, ποιῆσαι ἠθέλησεν. Sen. n. q. IV 13 § 6 (speaking of the fashion of drinking snow) *quae huius rei causa est nisi intestinum malum et luxu corrupta praecordia, quibus nullum intervallum umquam, quo interquiescerent, datum est, sed prandia* cenis usque in lucem perductis *ingesta sunt et distentos copia ferculorum ac varietate comessatio altius mersit?* V 11 § 1 *etesiae ob hoc 'somniculosi' a nautis et 'delicati' vocantur, quod, ut ait Gallio,* mane nesciunt surgere. ep. 71 § 23 *haec, ad quae omnes imbecilli sumus, dura atque intoleranda credimus, obliti, quam multis tormentum sit vino carere aut* prima luce excitari. 83 § 14 *L. Piso, urbis custos, ebrius, ex quo semel factus est, fuit.* maiorem partem noctis in convivio exigebat. usque in horam fere sextam dormiebat. hoc erat eius matutinum. Athen. 520ª ὅθεν καὶ ῥηθῆναι ὅτι τὸν βουλόμενον ἐν Συβάρει μὴ πρὸ μοίρας ἀποθανεῖν οὔτε δυόμενον οὔτε ἀνίσχοντα τὸν ἥλιον ὁρᾶν δεῖ. Sen. ep. 122 § 2 *sunt qui* officia lucis noctisque perverterint *nec ante diducunt oculos hesterna graves crapula quam adpetere nox coepit...sunt quidam in eadem urbe antipodes, qui, ut M. Cato dicit,* nec orientem umquam solem viderunt nec occidentem. Colum. I praef. § 16 *noctesque libidinibus et ebrietatibus, dies ludo vel somno consumimus; ac nosmetipsos ducimus fortunatos,* quod nec orientem solem vidimus nec occidentem. Petron. 73 f. usque in lucem cenemus. Hor. ep. I 2 30 *cui pulchrum fuit* in medios dormire dies. Liv. XXXI 41 10 *cum Aetoli...in castris sine stationibus* per somnum vinumque dies noctibus aequarent. VM. IX 15 E § 1 cum e convivio, non post occasum solis, sed post ortum surrexisset. Sen. contr. II 1 (9) § 15 pr. *quare abdicas? numquid* dies noctesque impendo turpibus conviviis? Lamprid. Heliog. 28 § 6 transegit et dierum actus noctibus et nocturnos diebus, *aestimans hoc inter instrumenta luxuriae ita ut* sero de somno surgeret et salutari inciperet, mane autem dormire inceptaret. Capitolin. Ver. 4 § 6 *fertur et* nocte perpeti alea lusisse.

12 QUO SIGNA DUCES ET CASTRA MOVEBANT Cic. p. Mur.

§ 22 *vigilas tu de nocte, ut tuis consultoribus respondeas, ille ut eo, quo intendit, mature cum exercitu perveniat; te gallorum, illum bucinarum cantus exsuscitat.*

13 ALLOBROGICIS Desjardins, Gaules III 289.

14 NATUS IN HERCULEO FABIUS LARE 131 n. Fabius is (Sil. VIII 217) *Tirynthius heros.* Cf. lexx. s.v. *Tirynthius.* G. C. Lewis, Credibility etc. ch. 8 § 5. Paulus Fest. p. 87. Antonius also (App. III 16 f. 19 f. Plut. v. Ant. 4. 36. 60) claimed descent from Hercules.

15 MOLLIOR Gron. on Sen. ep. 82 (first note).

16 TENERUM ATTRITUS CATINENSI PUMICE LUMBUM the only ex. in Iuv. of this accus. with participle (Kiaer 214). Menander (fr. Ὀργή, Athen. 166ª) *παρατιλοῦμαι.* Athen. 565ᵉᶠ *οὐ δεῖ οὖν οὕτως* (as Stoics) *ἐσταλμένους περὶ ἀργύριον ἐπτοῆσθαι καὶ ἐρωμένους περιάγεσθαι ξυρουμένους τὴν ὑπήνην καὶ τὸν ὄρρον.* Fronto p. 128 Naber *equi incuria horridi,* equites volsi: raro bracchium aut crus militum hirsutum. Iulian Misopogon p. 346ª *ἄνδρας ἀπεψιλωμένους οὔτι τὰς γνάθους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα, λειότεροι τῶν γυναικῶν ὅπως φαίνοιντο τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν.*

17 TRADUCIT Sen. ep. 108 § 14 *voluptates nostras* traducere, *laudare castum corpus.* VENENI Apul. met. X 4—12.

19 20 TOTA LICET VETERES EXORNENT UNDIQUE CERAE ATRIA, NOBILITAS SOLA EST ATQUE UNICA VIRTUS Stob. flor. LXXXVI. Epict. IV 1 § 57 *καὶ μή μοι πάππους αὐτοῦ καὶ προπάππους βλέπε καὶ ὠνὴν ζήτει καὶ πρᾶσιν. ἀλλ', ἂν ἀκούσῃς λέγοντος ἔσωθεν καὶ ἐκ πάθους, Κύριε· κἂν δώδεκα ῥάβδοι προάγωσι* (cf. Iuv. ver. 23 *virgas*), *λέγε δοῦλον.* DL. III 89 with Menage *ἄλλο εἶδος ἐὰν αὐτός τις ᾖ γενναδας τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μεγαλόψυχος, καὶ τοῦτον εὐγενῆ φασιν· καὶ τῆς γε εὐγενείας αὕτη κρατίστη.* Hier. ep. 148 § 21 sola *apud Deum* est nobilitas, *clarum esse* virtutibus. Phalar. ep. 144 *ἐγὼ δὲ μίαν εὐγένειαν ἀρετὴν οἶδα.* Greg. Naz. or. 26 (28) 10 f. (I 479ª ᵉ).

20 ATRIA Vitruv. VI 4 p. 142 10 R *fauces minoribus* atriis *e tablini latitudine dempta tertia, maioribus dimidia constituantur.* imagines *item alte cum suis ornamentis sint constitutae.* cf. c. 8 p. 145 24—27 on the grandeur of the *vestibula regalia*

alta, atria et peristylia amplissima. cf. Tert. cited on v 19 p. 247.

SOLA ATQUE UNICA Hor. ep. I 6 1 2 Obbar *nil admirari prope res est* una, *Numici,* | solaque, *quae possit facere ac servare beatum.*

21 PAULUS VEL COSSUS Sen. clem. I 9 § 10 Augustus to L. Cinna, who had conspired against him: *cedo, si spes tuas solus impedio,* Paulusne *et* Fabius Maximus (cf. ver. 14) *et* Cossi *et Servilii ferent tantumque agmen nobilium non inania nomina praeferentium, sed eorum, qui* imaginibus suis decori sunt? With the whole verse cf. Plut. II 352^{c}.

23 PRAECEDANT IPSAS ILLI TE CONSULE VIRGAS Auson. protrept. ad nepotem (XIII 2 Schenkl) 100 *speresque tuos te consule fasces.*

24 ANIMI BONA Ov. tr. I 5 (6) 34 *prima* bonis animi *conspicerere tui.* [Sen.] Octav. 548—9 *sola perpetuo manent subiecta nulli mentis atque* animi bona.

26 AGNOSCO PROCEREM Tac. G. 20 *dominum ac servum nullis educationis deliciis dinoscas: inter eadem pecora, in eadem humo degunt, donec aetas separet ingenuos, virtus* agnoscat.

27 SILANUS on the Iunii Silani see Mommsen in Ephem. epigr. I 57—67. Schiller's Nero 180, 193. Tac. XIII 1 (of M. Iunius Silanus) *nobilem et quod tunc spectaretur, e Caesarum posteris: quippe et Silanus divi Augusti abnepos erat.* XV 35 *Torquatus Silanus mori adigitur, quia super* Iuniae familiae claritudinem *divum Augustum abavum ferebat.* Philo leg. ad Gai. 7 pr. (of M. Silanus) *γένει λαμπρός.* ib. 11 pr. *οὐδενὸς τῶν ἐν συγκλήτῳ δεύτερος.*

28 CONTINGIS Quintil. decl. 11 § 1 *ultioni meae* contingit *bonus pater.*

29 EXCLAMARE LIBET Sen. ep. 64 § 24 libet exclamare = ben. II 11 § 1. cf. Mart. X 31 5 exclamare libet. Orient. 2 75.

29 30 POPULUS QUOD CLAMAT OSIRI INVENTO Ov. met. IX 692 *numquamque satis* quaesitus Osiris. Luc. VIII 833 *et quem tu plangens hominem testaris* Osirim. Prud. c. Symm. I 629 *Isidis* amissum *semper plangentis* Osirim. Arnob. I 36 *Aethiopicis solibus Isis furva maerens perditum filium, et mem-*

bratim coniugem lancinatum. Orph. Argon. 32 *θρήνους τ' Αἰγυπτίων καὶ Ὀσίριδος ἱερὰ χύτλα.* Mart. Cap. § 4 f. Serv. Aen. IV 609 *in Isidis sacris, ubi est imitatio* inventi Osiridis, *quem dilaniatum a Typhone eius fratrem uxor Isis per totum orbem requisisse narratur.*

31 32 PRAECLARO NOMINE TANTUM INSIGNIS *nomen*, like *ὄνομα* and *λόγος*, opposed to reality (Staveren on Nep. Ages. 1 § 2). cf. Cic. legg. I § 45 *opinio*)(*natura.*

32 NANUM CUIUSDAM ATLANTA VOCAMUS on the same principle a giant and giantess, who lived under Augustus, and whose corpses were preserved in the *horti Sallustiani*, were called Pusio and Secundilla (Plin. VII § 75 cited on ver. 33). Pedro La Gasca, the priest who defeated Pizarro, was called (Michel de L'hôpital tells us) 'parce qu'il estoit de petite stature,... Goliath par dérision.' Auson. epigr. 122 (p. 428 n. 20 Peiper) is an adaptation of an epigram of Lucillius (anth. Pal. XI 104) *ἱππεύων μύρμηκι Μενέστρατος, ὡς ἐλέφαντι, | δύσμορος ἐξαπίνης ὕπτιος ἐξετάθη, | λακτισθεὶς δ' ὡς εἶχε τὸ καίριον· 'ὦ φθόνε,' φησίν, | 'οὕτως ἱππεύων ὤλετο καὶ Φαέθων.'* Nicephor. hist. eccl. XII 37 f. copies Philostorgius. Chrys. hom. 3 in 1 Tim. c. 1 § 3 (XI 565[de]) we shall never neglect a starving friend; but when Christ daily entreats us, not for some great thing, but for bare bread, we do not even admit Him; *καὶ ταῦτα ἐρευγόμενοι δυσωδίας καὶ διασπώμενοι καὶ γαστριζόμενοι καὶ τὸν χθεσινὸν οἶνον ἀποπνέοντες καὶ τρυφῶντες, καὶ οἱ μὲν πόρναις διδόντες, οἱ δὲ παρασίτοις, οἱ δὲ κόλαξιν, οἱ δὲ τέρασι καὶ μωροῖς καὶ νάννοις· καὶ γὰρ τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἁμαρτήματα ταῦτα φέρουσιν εἰς τέρψιν.* hom. 17 on 1 Tim. c. 6 § 2 (XI 649[e]) *πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἀνόητος ἐπιθυμία, ὅταν μωροὺς ἔχωσιν, ὅταν νάννους, οὐ φιλανθρωπίας ἕνεκεν, ἀλλὰ τέρψεως;* So in Passages from the French and Italian note-books of Nathaniel Hawthorne (Strahan, London 1871, II 11) we read under date 9 June 1858: "his < R. Browning's > little boy Robert, whom they call 'Pennini' for fondness. The latter cognomen is a diminutive of Apennino, which was bestowed upon him at his first advent into the world, because he was so very small, there being a statue in Florence of colossal size called Apennino."

On the word *nanus* Gellius has a whole chapter (XIX 13).

Martial (I 43 9 10) alludes to dwarfs combating in the amphitheatre. *nudus aper, sed et hic minimus qualisque necari | a non armato* pumilione *potest.* The formidable informer Carus was a *nanus* (schol. Iuv. I 35), and as such would have had access to the great. These fashionable pets were kept in the European courts and mansions even of the 17th and 18th centuries. See as to Jeffery Hudson the Dict. Nat. Biography; cf. Borulawski's memoirs; Encycl. Brit. s. v. *dwarf.*

33 AETHIOPEM Petr. 34. 102. Mart. VII 87 (a catalogue of strange pets, magpie, ichneumon, snake cet. ending ver. 10 *qui videt haec dominis monstra placere suis*) 2 *si fruitur tristi Canius* Aethiope.

PARVAM EXTORTAMQUE PUELLAM Petr. 28 *deliciae eius puer vetulus, lippus, domino Trimalchione deformior.* cf. Luc. conviv. 18. The market of monstrosities occurs also in Plut. adv. Coloten 3 § 1 p. 1108[d] *ὥσπερ ἀγορὰν ἢ πίνακα τεράτων συντίθησι τὸ βιβλίον.* Synes. de regno (to Arcadius) p. 15[ab] boldly rebukes the court for closing its doors to real merit, while opening them to deformed favorites: *καὶ γὰρ οἷς σύνεστε περὶ δίαιτάν τε καὶ ἄλλως καὶ οἷς ἐστιν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια πάροδος ἀδεέστερον ἢ στρατηγοῖς τε καὶ λοχαγοῖς, τούτους οὓς χαρίεντας ἄρα παρασκευάζεσθε, τοὺς μικροκεφάλους τε καὶ ὀλιγογνώμονας, οὓς ἡ φύσις ἁμαρτάνουσα παραχαράττει, καθάπερ ἀδικοῦντες οἱ τραπεζῖται τὸ νόμισμα· καὶ γὰρ βασιλεῖ δῶρον ἀπόπληκτος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ μεῖζον ὅσον ἀποπληκτότερος· οὗτοι γελασείοντες ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ κλαυσείοντες ἀτελῶς καὶ σχήμασι καὶ ψόφοις καὶ ἅπασιν ὅσοις οἷοί τε βωμολοχοῦντες συνδιαφθείρουσιν ὑμῖν τὸν χρόνον καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἀχλύν, ἣν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ φύσει ζῆν ἔχετε, κακῷ μείζονι παραμυθοῦνται.*

37 38 ERGO CAVEBIS ET METUES, NE TU SIC CRETICUS AUT CAMERINUS such an ironical euphemism in Iustin XXIX 1 § 5 *Aegyptum patre ac matre interfectis occupaverat Ptolomeus,* cui ex facinoris crimine cognomentum Philopator fuit. Aristid. or. 46 (II 406—7 Dind.) calumniators call themselves philosophers, as if Phrynondas should take the name of Aeacus, a thief of Rhadamanthys, Thersites of Hyacinthus or Narcissus, Lycaon of Hector, Coroebus of Palamedes, Margites of Nestor, Battus of Stentor.

38 CRETICUS in imperial times these honorary *cognomina* came again into vogue (Borghesi oeuvres I 251).

40 TUMES ALTO DRUSORUM SANGUINE Hor. ep. I 1 36 Obbar *laudis amore* tumes? Stat. I 2 263 *pulchra* tumeat *Sebetos alumna.* Sil. XV 291—2 *hic gente egregius, veterisque ab origine regni | Aeacidum sceptris proavoque* tumebat *Achille.*

42 QUAE SANGUINE FULGET IULI, on the claim of the Iulii to descent from Iulus see Schwegler röm. Gesch. I 306—7, 335—9, 537. G. C. Lewis Credibility ch. 9 § 11 n. 178.

47 IMA PLEBE QUIRITEM FACUNDUM INVENIES Petr. 46 a tradesman's son learnt Greek as well as Latin; *emi ergo nunc puero aliquot libra rubricata, quia volo illum ad domusionem aliquid de iure gustare. habet haec res panem...ideo illi cotidie clamo: 'Primigeni, crede mihi, quicquid discis, tibi discis. vides Phileronem causidicum: si non didicisset, hodie famem a labris non abigeret. modo, modo collo suo circumferebat onera venalia...litterae thesaurum est et artificium numquam moritur.'* Formerly nobles only were lawyers Cic. de or. I § 235 *clarissimi cives ei studio etiam hodie praesunt.* Pomponius in dig. I 2 2 § 43 Servius Sulpicius, the great jurist, was shamed into the study of law by Quintus Mucius, who said: *turpe esse patricio et nobili et causas oranti ius, in quo versaretur, ignorare.* But times had changed. Tac. XI 7 *cogitaret* plebem, quae toga enitesceret; *sublatis studiorum pretiis etiam studia peritura.*

IMA PLEBE QUIRITEM Ov. am. I 7 9 minimum de plebe Quiritem.

49 NOBILIS INDOCTI Madvig on Cic. fin. II § 54 *non de improbo, sed de* callido improbo *quaerimus.* Seyffert-Müller on Cic. Lael. § 54 p. 366 (Leipz. 1876).

50 IURIS NODOS ET LEGUM AENIGMATA Hor. s. I 1 9 iuris legumque *peritus.* Coripp. paneg. in laud. Anastas. 27 *principis auspicio* leges et iura *gubernans.* Cassiod. var. VIII 13 f. *vox* legum *diceris, dum nos* iura *condimus.*

IURIS NODOS Bentley on Hor. a. p. 424.

51 52 HIC PETIT EUPHRATEN IUVENIS DOMITIQUE BATAVI CUSTODES AQUILAS Ov. tr. II 225—9 *nunc tibi Pannonia est, nunc Illyris ora domanda: | Rhaetia nunc praebent Thraciaque arma metum: | nunc petit Armenius pacem: nunc porrigit*

arcus | Parthus eques timida captaque signa manu. | nunc te prole tua iuvenem Germania sentit. Sen. brev. vit. 4 § 5 (of Augustus) *dum ultra* Rhenum et Euphraten *et Danubium terminos movet.* n. q. I pr. § 8 *o quam ridiculi sunt mortalium termini! ultra Istrum Dacus non exeat....Parthis obstet* Euphrates. *Danubius Sarmatica et Romana disterminet.* Rhenus *Germaniae modum faciat* cet. VI 7 § 1 *hinc, qui medius inter pacata et hostilia fluit, Danubius ac* Rhenus, *alter Sarmaticos impetus cohibens et Europam Asiamque disterminans, alter Germanos, avidam gentem belli, repellens.* Cf. Tac. G. 29. Mart. X 7 (the Rhine, ver. 7 *Romanus eas utraque ripa*). AV. Caes. 4 § 2 (Claudius) *retenti fines seu dati imperio Romano, Mesopotamia per orientem, Rhenus Danubiusque ad septentrionem.*

53 CECROPIDES Greg. Naz. or. 43 (20) 3 (I 772[d]) if I were to descant on the ancestry of Basil, *οὐδὲν ἂν ἦσαν ἡμῖν οἱ Πελοπίδαι καὶ Κεκροπίδαι καὶ οἱ Ἀλκμαίωνες Αἰακίδαι τε καὶ Ἡρακλεῖδαι, καὶ ὧν οὐδὲν ὑψηλότερον· οἵ τινες ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων φανερῶς εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχοντες, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀφανὲς καταφεύγουσι, δαίμονας δή τινας καὶ θεοὺς καὶ μύθους τοῖς προγόνοις ἐπιφημίζοντες, ὧν τὸ σεμνότατον ἀπιστία καὶ ὕβρις τὸ πιστευόμενον.* The name is often used satirically, thus anth. Pal. XI 319 as you bring ten measures of coal, be a citizen; if pigs also, a Triptolemus. Give to the scribe Heraclides some cabbages or shell-fish, or a parcel of lentils: *ταῦτ' ἔχε, καὶ λέγε σαυτὸν Ἐρεχθέα, Κέκροπα, Κόδρον, | ὅν κ' ἐθέλῃς* (sec ver. 131—134). *οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐπιστρέφεται.* Synes. ep. 3 *Ἁρμόνιος...ὁ τοῦ θυρωροῦ πατήρ,...τὰ μὲν ἄλλα σώφρων καὶ μέτριος ἐν τῷ καθ' ἑαυτὸν βίῳ γενόμενος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ εὐγενείας ἀμφισβητῶν τῷ Κέκροπι διετέλεσε.* Cf. Luc. necyom. 16. Remember that Cecrops was the first king of a people coaeval with the sun (Menander in Walz rhet. Gr. IX 181); that he was the first man, earth-born (cf. Plat. Menex. 237[b]. Himer. or. 1 § 9. 2 § 3. 7 § 4).

TRUNCOQUE SIMILLIMUS HERMAE Plat. Hipp. mai. 292[d] *οὐδέν σοι μᾶλλον γεγωνεῖν δύναμαι ἢ εἴ μοι παρεκάθησο λίθος, καὶ οὗτος μυλίας, μήτε ὦτα μήτ' ἐγκέφαλον ἔχων.* Xen. Laced. r. p. 3 § 5 of the Spartan youth: *ἐκείνων γοῦν ἧττον μὲν ἂν φωνὴν ἀκούσαις ἢ τῶν λιθίνων, ἧττον δ' ἂν ὄμματα μετα-*

στρέψαις ἢ τῶν χαλκῶν. Hor. ep. II 2 83 statua taciturnius *exit.* Anaxandrides in the Twins and the Cyrenaeans applied the term *βρέτας* to an *ἀναίσθητος* (Bekker anecd. 85 19. 223). When asked by a father what good his son would derive from education, Aristippus (DL. II § 72) replied: 'If no other, *ἐν γοῦν τῷ θεάτρῳ οὐ καθεδεῖται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ.*' Epictet. III 2 § 4 *οὐ γὰρ δεῖ με εἶναι ἀπαθῆ ὡς ἀνδριάντα.* 12 § 10 *ἄνθρωπε, ἄσκησον, εἰ γοργὸς εἶ, λοιδορούμενος ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀτιμασθεὶς μὴ ἀχθεσθῆναι. εἶθ' οὕτω προβήσει, ἵνα, κἂν πλήξῃ σέ τις, εἴπῃς αὐτὸς πρὸς αὑτόν, ὅτι Δόξον ἀνδριάντα περιειληφέναι.* Luc. imag. 1 *ἀχανῆ σε καὶ τῶν ἀνδριάντων ἀκινητότερον ἀποφανεῖ.* Eunap. vit. p. 471 54 Didot *οἱ δὲ τῶν θειοτέρων τι προβάλλοντες, ἀνδριάντι συνετύγχανον.* p. 477 10 *ὁ δὲ Χρυσάνθιος ἀκινητότερος ἐπέμενεν ἀνδριάντος.* Sotion in Westermann paradoxographi p. 187 n. 25 (inscription on a fountain, which made those who drank of it *ἀναισθήτους ταῖς ψυχαῖς*) *ἀλλὰ νόῳ πέτρος ὁ τῆσδε <τῆς πηγῆς> πιών.* Palladas in anth. Pal. XI 317 *κωφὸν ἄναυδον ὁρῶν τὸν Γέσσιον, εἰ λίθος ἐστί,* | *Δήλιε, μαντεύω, τίς τίνος ἐστὶ λίθος;* Clem. Al. protr. 1 § 4 (p. 4 P) *λίθοι δὲ καὶ ξύλα οἱ ἄφρονες· πρὸς δὲ καὶ λίθων ἀναισθητότερος ἄνθρωπος ἀνοίᾳ βεβαπτισμένος.* cf. ibid. 4 § 62 (p. 54 P) *ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν ὅπως ποτὲ ὁ ἀνδριὰς ὅτι μάλιστα ὡραιότατος τεκταίνηται, προσκαρτερεῖτε, ὅπως δὲ αὐτοὶ μὴ ὅμοιοι δι' ἀναισθησίαν τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ἀποτελεσθῆτε, οὐ φροντίζετε;* Chrys. hom. 5 in Col. 1 § 1 (XI 358[d]) *τὸ γὰρ ἀθρόως ἀνθρώπους λίθων ἀναισθητοτέρους εἰς ἀγγέλων ἀγαγεῖν ἀξίωμα ἁπλῶς διὰ ψιλῶν ῥημάτων καὶ πίστεως μόνης χωρὶς ἐργωδίας πάσης, ὄντως δόξα καὶ πλοῦτος μυστηρίου.* Sidon. ep. V 7 § 4 *in conlocutionibus* statuae,...*ad intellegendum* saxei, *ad iudicandum* lignei. cf. lexx. s. vv. *rupex. stipes. truncus.* Simeon in Nicephor. hist. eccl. XIII 26. Wetstein on Matt. 3 9. A. Otto, die Sprichwörter....der Römer (Leipz. 1890) 185—6 (*lapis*). 310 (*saxum*). 331 (*statua*). 332 (*stipes*). Fr. Jacobs, verm. Schr. V 219—220.

56 TEUCRORUM PROLES 131 n. Galba (Suet. 2) traced his descent from Iuppiter and Pasiphae. Nep. Datames 2 § 2 Thuys, a Paphlagonian chieftain sprung from the Pylaemenes, slain by Patroclus in the Trojan war. A descendant of the

Atridae (Athen. 597e). Jerome's friend Paula (Hier. ep. 108 = 27 § 33) *Agamemnonis inclita proles.* Cf. Bayle *Vespasien* note g.

ANIMALIA MUTA XV 143 n. *a grege* mutorum. Sen. ira III 30 § 1. ben. VI 7 § 3. ep. 76 § 26 *illud quoque dixeram, si bona sunt ea, quae tam homini contingunt quam* mutis animalibus, *et* muta animalia *beatam vitam actura : quod fieri nullo modo potest.*

57 QUIS GENEROSA PUTET, NISI FORTIA? Sen. ep. 95 § 67 *putas utile dari tibi argumenta, per quae intellegas* nobilem equum, *ne fallaris empturus* (cf. Iuv. ver. 62—66), *ne operam perdas in ignavo : quanto hoc utilius est, excellentis animi notas nosse, quas ex alio in se transferre permittitur?* Epict. III 14 § 11 "*κρείσσων εἰμί σου, ὁ γὰρ πατήρ μου ὑπατικός ἐστιν.*" *ἄλλος λέγει,* "*ἐγὼ δεδημάρχηκα, σὺ δ' οὔ.*" § 12 *εἰ δ' ἵπποι ἦμεν, ἔλεγες ἄν, ὅτι* "*ὁ πατήρ μου ὠκύτερος ἦν*"; *ὅτι* "*ἐγὼ ἔχω πολλὰς κριθὰς καὶ χόρτον*"; *ἢ ὅτι* "*κομψὰ περιτραχήλια*"; *εἰ οὖν ταῦτά σου λέγοντος, εἶπον ὅτι* "*ἔστω ταῦτα, τρέχωμεν οὖν.*" § 13 *ἄγε, ἐπ' ἀνθρώπου οὖν οὐδέν ἐστι τοιοῦτον οἷον ἐφ' ἵππου δρόμος, ἐξ οὗ γνωσθήσεται ὁ κρείττων καὶ ὁ χείρων; μήποτ' ἔστιν αἰδώς, πίστις, δικαιοσύνη;* § 14 *τούτοις δείκνυε κρείττονα σεαυτόν, ἵν' ὡς ἄνθρωπος ᾖς κρείττων. ἄν μοι λέγῃς, ὅτι* "*μέγαλα λακτίζω,*" *ἐρῶ σοι κἀγώ, ὅτι ἐπὶ ὄνου ἔργῳ μέγα φρονεῖς.* Nor is wealth, or ostentatious display, a proof of nobility. Socrates in Stob. fl. I 37 *οὔτε ἵππος εὐγενὴς κρίνοιτ' ἂν ὁ πολυτελῆ σκεύη ἔχων ἀλλ' ὁ τῇ φύσει λαμπρός, οὔτε ἀνὴρ σπουδαῖος ὁ πολύτιμον οὐσίαν κεκτημένος ἀλλ' ὁ τὴν ψυχὴν γενναῖος.* Cf. Sen. ep. 80 § 8. Plut. comp. Lysandri cum Sulla 2 § 2. Onosander strat. 1 § 21. Apul. de deo Socr. 23 pr. apol. 21. Macr. Sat. I 11 § 10. Greg. Naz. or. 43 (20) c. 4 (I 773a).

58 PLURIMA sing. cf. I. 120 n. PALMA Spartian Sever. 22 § 3 *die* circensium *cum tres Victoriolae more solito essent locatae gypseae cum* palmis. Ov. tr. IV. 8 19 20 *ne cadat et* multas palmas *inhonestet adeptas,* | *languidus in pratis gramina carpit equus.*

59 RAUCO CIRCO shouts in the circus XI 197 n.

60 NOBILIS Ov. am. III 2 1 *non ego* nobilium *sedeo studiosus*

equorum. Sil. XVI 329—330 nobile *nomen* | *antiqui stabuli.* Basil hom. in divites c. 2 (II 53[c]) *ἵπποι παμπληθεῖς, καὶ οὗτοι γενεαλογούμενοι ἀπὸ εὐγενείας πατέρων, ὥσπερ οἱ ἄνθρωποι.*

62 CORYPHAEI POSTERITAS Ambr. hexaëm. VI 4 § 29 *novit vulpecula quomodo* posteritatem *foveat suam.* Hemst. on Luc. Nigrin. 29 *τὰ τῶν ἵππων ὀνόματα.*

64 NIL IBI MAIORUM RESPECTUS Sen. ben. VII 21 § 1 *omisso pudoris rectique* respectu. ep. 76 § 18 n. *omnes actiones totius vitae honesti ac turpis* respectu *temperantur.* cf. de ira II 9 § 1. ben. IV 32 § 2. VI 13 § 1 (*sine* respectu *sui*, a common phrase). Sen. contr. 2 § 9. Plin. II § 143 *in eo* respectu. Tac. d. 16.

67 DIGNIQUE MOLAM VERSARE proverbially the last stage in a horse's decline Aesop. 174 (= 193 Coraës) *ἵππος γέρων.* 174[b] (193) *ἵππος καὶ μυλωρός.* Babrius 29. Phaedr. append. 19 ('equus quadrigalis in pistrinum venumdatus') 1—7 *equum e quadriga* multis palmis nobilem | *abegit quidam et in pistrinum vendidit.* | *productus ad bibendum cum foret a* molis,| *in* circum *aequales ire conspexit suos,* | *ut grata ludis redderent certamina.* | *lacrimis obortis: 'ite felices,' ait,* | *'celebrate sine me cursu sollemnem diem.'* The fable is also included in the *προγυμνάσματα* of Nicolaus I 3 (Walz rhet. Gr. I 266). cf. anthol. Pal. IX 19—21. Plaut. asin. 708—9. The proverb *ἵππου γῆρας* (append. prov. III 29 Leutsch. Macar. IV 80 Schneidewin) denotes a melancholy end generally. For the use of asses in mills see dig. XXXIII 7 12 § 10 asinum machinarium. Ambr. expos. evang. Luc. VIII § 63 (after citing § 62 Matt. 18 6 *expedit ei ut suspendatur* mola asinaria *in collo eius*) *non otiose simul positam putamus* molam asinariam, *collum hominis...cum asini typum populus gentilis acceperit, nonne tibi videtur tamquam* molam asinariam *volvere, quamdiu in imperitiae suae errore versatur, naturae quidem vinculis alligatus, ut verbum emolat, Deum quaerat, sed opertae mentis caecitate suffusus?...et ideo sine ulla cursus alacritate, vestigiis in se saepe redeuntibus, invitus usui laborat alieno. tamen qui molam volvit, consummandi aliquando finem operis habet et exeundae spem gerit caecitatis....*asinus *ergo* ad molam, *caecus ad lapidem.* Sozomen. VIII 6 § 3 Gerontius *νύκτωρ ἔφη τισὶν*

Ὀνοσκελίδα συλλαβόμενος, ξυρίσαι τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ μυλωνίῳ ἐμβαλεῖν. Greg. Naz. carm. sect. II (moralia) n. 26 39 40 (II 542) πῶς σὺ κάκιστος ἐών, τόσσον φρονέεις προγόνοισιν, | ὦ κάνθων μυλικέ, ἵππιον ὕψος ἔχων; See Blümner Technologie I 35—36.

DIGNI VERSARE VI 50 *paucae adeo Cereris vittas* contingere dignae. Kiaer 175.

NEPOTES I now acquiesce in this reading.

68 PRIVUM DL. IV 48 τὸ κάλλος ἀλλότριον ἀγαθόν. cf. 70 n. 75 n. Ov. met. XIII 140—1 *nam genus et proavos et quae non fecimus ipsi,* | vix ea nostra voco.

69 TITULIS INCIDERE Cic. Verr. IV § 74 *haec* < Diana > *erat posita Segestae sane excelsa in basi, in qua grandibus litteris P. Africani nomen erat* incisum *eumque Carthagine capta restituisse perscriptum.* For a comment take the *cursus honorum* in so many inscriptions. Hor. c. IV 8 13—15 incisa *notis marmora publicis,* | *per quae spiritus et vita redit bonis* | *post mortem ducibus.* Tert. apol. 50 (p. 300 Oehler) of philosophers *illis omnibus et statuas defunditis et imagines inscribitis et* titulos inciditis *in aeternitatem.*

69 70 HONORES QUOS ILLIS DAMUS AC DEDIMUS, QUIBUS OMNIA DEBES 75 n. Sen. ben. IV 30 § 1 *aliquando daturum me etiam indignis quaedam non negaverim in honorem aliorum, sicut in petendis* honoribus *quosdam turpissimos nobilitas industriis sed novis praetulit non sine ratione.* Apul. de deo Socr. 23, after shewing that horses are prized for their intrinsic merits (cf. 56 n. 62 n. 67 n.) *similiter igitur et in hominibus contemplandis noli illa aliena existimare, sed ipsum hominem penitus considera: ipsum meum Socratem pauperem specta.* aliena *autem voco,* quae parentes pepererunt *et quae fortuna largita est, quorum nihil laudibus mei Socratis admisceo; nullam* generositatem, *nullam* prosapiam, *nullos* longos natales...*haec enim cuncta, ut dico, aliena sunt...igitur omnia similiter aliena numeres licebit.* generosus est: parentes laudas. Minuc. 37 § 10 nobilitate generosus es: parentes tuos laudas. Hier. ep. 60 (al. 3) § 8 *nec me iactabo* de genere, *id est* de alienis bonis. Plut. reg. et imp. apophth. (Antigonus Secundus) n. 4 p. 183[d] ἐπεὶ δὲ νεανίσκος ἀνδρείου πατρός, αὐτὸς

δὲ μὴ πάνυ δοκῶν ἀγαθὸς εἶναι στρατιώτης, ἠξίου τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς λαβεῖν ἀποφοράς, "ἀλλ' ἐγώ," εἶπεν, "ὦ μειράκιον, ἀνδραγαθίας, οὐ πατραγαθίας, μισθοὺς καὶ δωρεὰς δίδωμι." Nearly the same words in the tract 'de vitioso pudore' 14 f. p. 534[e]. cf. the retort of Themistocles to the Seriphian. Herodian v 1 § 5 birth and wealth and the like μακαρίζεται μέν, οὐκ ἐπαινεῖται δέ, ὡς παρ' ἄλλου δοθέντα.

DAMUS AC DEDIMUS Liv. XXXVII 45 § 12 gessimus gerimusque. cf. Sen. const. sap. 7 § 1 *exhibuimus et exhibebimus.* Hor. ep. I 1 1 *prima dicte mihi, summa dicende camena.* In the synthetic languages of antiquity such expressions are far neater than any version in an analytical language.

72 INFLATUM see Obbar on Hor. ep. I 1 36. Mühlmann *inflo* col. 844—5.

73 RARUS...IN Plin. ep. VIII 23 § 2 rarum *hoc* in *adulescentibus nostris.*

SENSUS COMMUNIS Sen. ep. 95 § 62. Gataker on Anton. I 16.

75 76 SIC UT NIHIL IPSE FUTURAE LAUDIS AGAS Stat. s. V 1 51—3 *laudentur prouvis seu falsae munere formae, | quae morum caruere bonis falsoque potentes | laudis egent verae.*

78 STRATUS HUMI PALMES VIDUAS DESIDERAT ULMOS cf. ind. ulmus. Cic. de or. III § 22 *sed si hoc quoque videtur esse altius, quam ut id nos* humi stratos *suspicere possimus.* Tac. XVI 31 strata humi. Elms and vines Ov. met. XIV 661—6. her. 5. 47. tr. II 143. V 3 35 36. Pont. III 8 13. Obbar on Hor. ep. I 7 84 and 16 3. Plin. XVIII § 266 ulmum...vite *dotatam habes.* Sen. ep. 86 § 20. Annianus c. 3 1 2 (in L. Müller's Namatianus p. 42) *quando flagello iugas, ita iuga,| vitis et ulmus uti simul eant.* Ambr. hexaëm. IV § 1 pr. Not only its timber, and foliage prized as fodder, but above all its 'friendship for vines,' gave value to the elm (Plin. XVI § 72) *materie vitiumque amicitia accipitur ulmus.* Columella (V 6) speaks of the culture of the elm (§ 5 *ulmus, quod et vitem commodissime patitur, et iucundissimum pabulum bubus affert...a plerisque praefertur*).

81 PHALARIS Ov. tr. V 1 53—54. Pont. II 9 44 (Perillus). III 6 42 (the bull). Sen. exc. contr. V 8 p. 281 K *Siciliae fuisse*

dominus, qui inclusos aeneis tauris *homines subiectis urebat ignibus, ut mugitum ederent, verba non possent.* Sen. ep. 66 § 18 the famous saying of Epicurus (Usener's Epicurea 338—9), thus given by Cicero Tusc. II § 17: the wise man, in Phalaridis tauro *si erit, dicet: quam suave est, quam hoc non curo.* Probably Iuv. had this boast in his mind. Lact. III 19 § 8. 26 § 5 (speaking of the transformation of men by the Gospel) *da timidum doloris ac mortis, iam cruces et ignes et* Perilli taurum *contemnet.* 27 § 5. Capitol. Maximin. 8 § 5 for his cruelty Maximinus was named Cyclops, Busiris, Sciron, *Phalaris,* Typhon, *gigas.* E. A. Freeman (History of Sicily) has an exhaustive account of Phalaris and his bull.

83 SUMMUM CREDE NEFAS Luc. II 286 summum, *Brute,* nefas.

84 PROPTER VITAM VIVENDI PERDERE CAUSAS in another sense Sen. ep. 117 § 23 *omnia ista* <aqua, terra, spiritus> *tam* causae vivendi *sunt quam viae mortis.* cf. 58 § 36 *omne propter quod vivitur.* brev. vit. 9 § 1 *impendio vitae vitam instruunt.* Sil. VIII 81 82 (Anna to Aeneas) *nate dea, solus regni lucisque fuisti | germanae tu causa meae.*

87 EXPECTATA DIU TANDEM Catull. 62 2 expectata diu *vix* tandem.

PROVINCIA Plin. VII 24 in my note is a misprint for VIII 24. See Hertzberg Gesch. Griechenlands unter den Römern I 421—432. Höck I (3) 99—101, and esp. the last vol. of Mommsen's history.

89 MISERERE INOPUM SOCIORUM Sil. XIV 630 (in another sense) *socium miseret.*

90 in my note (p. 19 l. 2 from foot) I has fallen out before 18.

92 FULMINE Plin. III 11 § 3 n. often used by Ovid to denote the imperial wrath which blasted his life: tr. I 1 72 *venit in hoc illa* fulmen *ab arce caput.* 81 82 *me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iovis arma timere; | me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.* II 179 180 (to Augustus) *parce, precor,* fulmenque *tuum, fera tela, reconde, | heu nimium misero cognita tela mihi.* III 5 7. IV 3 69. 5 6. V 2 53. 3 31. Pont. I 7 46. cf. *ambustus* Fabri on Liv. XXII 35 § 2. Plin. ep. III 11 § 3 n. and ind. Sen. de

ira III 23 § 6 *nemo quasi* fulguritum *refugit.* cons. Polyb. 13 § 4 fulmina.

93 CAPITO Schiller's Nero 107.

RUERINT Plin. ep. III 9 § 34 *cum Castam accusarem, nihil magis pressi quam quod accusator eius praevaricationis crimine* corruisset.

94 PIRATAE CILICUM Lucian Icaromen. 16 f. *ὁ Κίλιξ ἐλῃστευε.*

96 PRAECONEM, CHAERIPPE, TUIS CIRCUMSPICE PANNIS Cic. Att. XIV 21 § 4 *talaria* circumspiciamus. cf. Sen. ep. 63 § 11. Plin. ep. III 3 § 3 n. *iam* circumspiciendus *rhetor Latinus.* Stat. s. V 2 162–3 *cuneosque per omnes | te meus absentem* circumspectabit *Achilles.* Theb. X 362–3 *comitem* circumspicit *olim | mens humilis luctu.* Hier. reg. S. Pachomii 53 (II 64[b] ed. Ven. 1767) videbunt*que virum cuius fides et disciplina probata sit.*

97 FUROR EST...PERDERE I 92 n. (pp. 132. 340). XIV 136 n. Plin. II § 3 furor est *mensuram eius* <mundi> *quosdam agitasse atque prodere ausos.* § 4 furor est, *profecto* furor, *egredi ex eo.* cf. XXXVII § 29 *alius et in his* furor, *centum quinquaginta milibus trullam unam non ante multos annos mercata matre familias nec divite.*

100 PLENA DOMUS TUNC OMNIS Cic. Verr. II § 35 plena domus *argenti caelati optimi multaeque stragulae vestis.* On Caligula's depredations see Suet. 22. 57. DCass. LIX 28 §§ 3 4. LX 6 § 8. Paus. IX 27 § 3. Ios. ant. XIX 1 § 1. On Nero's ver. 111 n. Hertzberg Gesch. Griechenlands unter den Römern II 97–99. Tac. XVI 23 Barea Soranus, who had been proconsul of Asia, offended Nero because *vim...civitatis Pergamenae, prohibentis Acratum Caesaris libertum statuas et picturas evehere, inultam omiserat.* id. Agr. 6 f. DChrys. or. 31 p. 355 M = 641 R. Suet. 32 f. DCass. LXIII 11. Schiller Nero 247–251 reduces the amount of plunder, systematically discussing the statements of Pausanias. Schiller's reference (p. 248 n. 1) to Philostr. v. Apoll. V 2 is wrong; read V 7 § 3 where he says that Nero by his songs injured Greece more than Xerxes by his conflagration; cf. § 4 *οὐκ ἔξεστι σπουδαῖον οὐδὲν ἢ σκεῦος ἢ ἀνδράποδον αὐτοῖς πεπᾶσθαι.*

101 SPARTANA Ov. r. a. 707–8 *confer* Amyclaeis *medicatum vellus aënis | murice cum Tyrio: turpius illud erit.*

COA XI 188 n.

103 VIVEBAT Cic. Hortens. fr. 20 Müller (Non. p. 128 2) *nam cum omnis sollertia admiranda est, tum ea, quae efficit, ut, inanima quae sint,* vivere et spirare *videantur.* Ov. met. x 250 (of Pygmalion's statue) *virginis est verae facies, quam* vivere *credas.* Petr. 52 pr. *habeo scyphos urnales plus minus C: quemadmodum Cassandra occidit filios suos, et pueri mortui iacent sic ut* vivere *putes.* Prud. apoth. 724–5 Heins *non sicut sculptor ab aeris | rudere decoctam consuescit* vivere *massam.* Stat s. I 3 47—48 *vidi artes veterumque manus variisque metalla |* viva *modis.*

EBUR Luc. de sacrif. 11.

POLYCLITI Cic. parad. § 37 *in civitate, qui se istarum rerum cupiditatibus dediderunt, ipsius servitutis locum paene infimum obtinent. 'Magna,' inquit, 'bella gessi, magnis imperiis et provinciis praefui.' gere igitur animum laude dignum. Aëtionis tabula te stupidum detinet aut* signum *aliquod* Polycliti. *mitto, unde sustuleris, quo modo habeas.*

111 SIQUIS...DEUS UNICUS Cic. Verr. IV § 58 *sic habetote plures esse a Syracusanis istius adventu deos, quam victoria Marcelli homines desideratos.*

AEDICULA one of Tellus existing Preller-Jordan, röm. Mythol. II[3] 4 n. Representations in the Pompeian wall paintings (Pauly I[2] (1) 207—8). Specimens in terra cotta have been found at Athens and Marseilles (Saglio in Daremberg-Saglio I 84—87). Minuc. 33 § 1 *et cum homo latius maneam, intra unam* aediculam *vim tantae maiestatis includam?*

112 PRO SUMMIS Wopkens und Benecke on Iustin XXIII 3 § 9 pro *victo fugere visus est.*

113 INBELLIS RHODIOS cet. Cic. p. imp. Pomp. §§ 64—68 extols the *continentia* of Pompeius amid the temptations of a *bellum Asiaticum.* Tac. Agr. 6 (with Orelli's n.) *sors quaesturae provinciam Asiam, proconsulem Salvium Titianum dedit, quorum neutro corruptus est, quamquam et provincia dives ac parata peccantibus, et proconsul in omnem aviditatem pronus quantalibet facilitate redempturus esset mutuam dissimulationem*

mali. h. II 80 f. Mucianus won Syria and the armies there for Vespasian by giving out, *statuisse Vitellium, ut Germanicas legiones in Syriam ad militiam opulentam quietamque transferret, contra Syriacis legionibus Germanica hiberna caelo ac laboribus dura mutarentur.* Similarly Suet. Vesp. 6. Iustin XXXVIII 4 § 7 *in Asia, quae dicitur* inbellis. paneg. IX 24 an easy matter *vincere timidos et* inbelles *quales amoena Graeciae et deliciae orientis educunt . . . Romanum vero militem . . . aut trucem Francum ferina sola carne distentum, qui vitam pro victus sui vilitate contemnat, quantae molis sit superare vel capere?* cf. G. C. Lewis on the methods of observation in politics II 93. Hertzberg II 287. 522.

UNCTAMQUE CORINTHON Hertzberg II 83.

114 115 RESINATA IUVENTUS cet. Prop. IV 8 23 *serica nam taceo* vulsi *carpenta, nepotis.* Sen. n. q. I 17 § 2 nature, when it produced surfaces capable of reflecting images, never intended *ut ad speculum barbam faciemque velleremus.* VII 31 § 2 *nondum satis robur omne proiecimus: adhuc quicquid est boni moris exstinguimus* levitate *et politura corporum.* Plin. XX § 20 *silvestre rapum...hoc ad levigandam cutem in facie totoque corpore utuntur.* Luc. Demonax 50 a proconsul, one τῶν πιττουμένων τὰ σκέλη καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὅλον, reproached by a cynic εἰς κιναιδίαν, was on the point of condemning his censor to a bastinado or exile. On the request of Demonax, the proconsul let him off, but asked: 'If he repeats the offence what punishment will he deserve?' καὶ ὁ Δημώναξ "δρωπακισθῆναι αὐτὸν τότε κέλευσον." Epictet. III 1 §§ 26—35, 42—45, is severe on the unmanly fashion. Suet. Aug. 68. Otho 12. Dom. 22 *develleret.* Mart. IX 28 1—7 (e.g. 4 *nec vivat ullus in tuo pilus* crure). Philostr. Apoll. IV 27 § 1. Fronto to Verus (p. 128 Naber) of the army at Antioch: *equi incuria horridi, equites* volsi: *raro bracchium aut* crus *militum hirsutum.* Among the effects of Commodus, put up for sale by his successor (Capitol. Pert. 8 § 5), were *vasa Samnitica calfactandae* resinae ac pici devellendis hominibus ac leviginandis. Lamprid. Heliog. 31 § 7. On the composition and use of depilatories see Adams on Paul. Aegin. III 52 (vol. I p. 588—9), and esp. Daremberg Oribase II 884—5. Galen

III 902 a wise and social creature should take a moderate care of his body, not like most men now-a-days, who, if a friend appeals for help, run away on the plea of engagements, *ὑποχωρήσαντες δέ πη πιττοῦνταί τε καὶ κομοῦνται καὶ κατατρίβουσι τὸν βίον ὅλον εἰς οὐκ ἀναγκαίαν τοῦ σώματος ὑπηρεσίαν, οὐδ' εἰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχουσι κρεῖττόν τι σώματος ἐπιστάμενοι.* VI 326—7 he prescribes in certain cases *πιττοῦσθαι τὰ σκέλη.* cf. 416 and ind. *psilothrum.*

116 HORRIDA VITANDA EST HISPANIA Iustin XLII 2 §§ 1 2 5 6 of the Spaniards, *corpora hominum ad inediam laboremque, animi ad mortem parati. dura omnibus et adstricta parsimonia. bellum quam otium malunt; si extraneus deest, domi hostem quaerunt..... velocitas genti pernix, inquies animus: plurimis militares equi et arma sanguine ipsorum cariora.*

GALLICUS AXIS Caes. b. G. II 30 § 4 *plerumque hominibus Gallis prae magnitudine corporum suorum brevitas nostra contemptui est.* Cf. Paus. X 20 § 7 who says that the Gauls are much the tallest race of men. Nero's professed contempt for Vindex (222 n.) cost him dear Plut. Galba 5 § 2. Suet. Nero 40 *adeoque lente ac secure tulit ut gaudentis etiam suspitionem praeberet, tamquam occasione nata spoliandarum iure belli opulentissimarum provinciarum.* DCass. LXIII 26 §§ 1—3. Sen. prov. 4 §§ 14 15 speaks of the bracing discipline of life in Germany and on the Danube.

AXIS Luc. IV 62 *ille suo nubes quascumque invenit in* axe. Sil. XVI 290—1 *aut his occideret campis aut* axe *relicto | Hesperio, patrias exsul lustraret harenas.*

117 MESSORIBUS Mart. VI 86 5 *possideat* Libycas messes. Parthenius 10 in Bährens P. L. fragm. p. 421 fertilis Africa frugum. Aristid. or. 14 (encomium Romae) I 326—7 Dind. *γεωργίαι δ' ὑμῶν Αἴγυπτος, Σικελία, Λιβύης τὸ ἥμερον.* Spartian. Pescenn. 5 § 4 Severus sent legions to Africa, *ne eam Pescennius occuparet et fame populum Romanum perurgeret.* Prud. c. Symm. II 937—945 (Libya, Sicily, Sardinia). Tiberius (Tac. an. II 54) saw that if Italy depended on foreign lands, as England does now, for its food (DCass. LX 11 § 2), luxury was to blame: *vita populi Romani per incerta maris et tempestatum cotidie volvitur.*

118 QUI SATURANT URBEM CIRCO SCENAEQUE VACANTEM Suet. Cal. 29 *equestrem ordinem ut scenae* harenaeque devotum *assidue proscidit.* Tac. d. 29 *histrionalis favor et gladiatorum equorumque studia.* Amm. XXVIII 4 § 28 *nunc ad otiosam plebem veniamus et desidem....* § 29 *hi omnes, quod vivunt, vino et tesseris impendunt et lustris et voluptatibus et spectaculis: eisque templum et habitaculum et contio et cupitorum spes omnis* Circus *est maximus.* cet. (cf. 157 n.). Prudent. c. Symm. II 948 quis venit esuriens magni ad spectacula Circi?

121 122 CURANDUM IN PRIMIS, NE MAGNA INIURIA FIAT FORTIBUS ET MISERIS Cic. fam. V 13 § 4 *nos erimus etiam in omnium rerum desperatione fortes.* Aen. II 354 *una salus victis nullam sperare salutem.* Ov. tr. I 4 4 *audaces cogimur esse metu.* Vell. II 5 § 3 *quem moriturum miserat militem victorem recepit: tantum effecit mixtus timori pudor spesque desperatione quaesita.* Curt. V 4 § 31 *ut opinor, ignaviam quoque necessitas acuit et saepe desperatio spei causa est.* Sen. n. q. II 59 § 5 *animus ex ipsa desperatione sumatur: ignavissima animalia, quae natura ad fugam genuit, ubi exitus non patet, temptant pugnam corpore inbelli. nullus perniciosior hostis est quam quem audacem angustiae faciunt, longeque violentius semper ex necessitate quam ex virtute concurritur* <so Madvig>, <*maiora*> *aut certe paria conatur animus magnus ac perditus.* Such passages suggested Milton's 'what resolution from despair.' See in Schiller's Nero 145, 147 seq. the extortions in Britain which led to the rising under Bouducca (Boadicea).

124 SPOLIATIS ARMA SUPERSUNT Plin. ep. III 9 § 17 *bona Classici quae habuisset ante provinciam placuit senatui a reliquis separari, illa filiae, haec* spoliatis *relinqui.* Tac. d. 41 *quam provinciam tuemur nisi* spoliatam *vexatamque?* Luc. IV 579 *ignoratque datos, ne quisquam serviat, enses.* On the policy of disarming the conquered see Sagittarius on Iustin I 7 § 12.

125 QUOD MODO PROPOSUI Sen. brev. vit. 10 § 1 quod proposui.

126 CREDITE ME VOBIS FOLIUM RECITARE SIBYLLAE Plaut. Pseud. 460 Lorenz *quod scibo,* Delphis tibi responsum *ducito.* Otto in Archiv f. lat. Lexikogr. III 213 (where he confounds Apollo with Apollos; "*ego plantavi, Apollo rigavit,*

wo Apollo ohne Zweifel identificiert ist mit dem Sonnengotte, der den Aeckern Regen und Sonnenschein spendet"). id. Sprichwörter pp. 30. 119. 321. On the Sibyls see Marquardt Staatsverw. III 2 42—45. 350—297. Preller-Jordan röm. Myth. I³ 300—312. On the infallibility of oracles Cic. p. Font. § 25 *ut quidque ex illo loco dicetur, ex* oraculo *aliquo dici arbitrabitur.* Cic. Tusc. I § 17 *ea, quae vis, ut potero explicabo, nec tamen quasi* Pythius Apollo, *certa ut sint et fixa quae dixero.* Gron. on Liv. V 51 § 7. Sen. cons. Polyb. 14 § 2 *aliud habebunt hoc dicente pondus verba velut ab* oraculo *missa.* ep. 108 § 26 *inhaereat istud animo et tamquam missum* oraculo *placeat.* 94 § 28 *illa aut reddita* oraculo, *aut similia.* TEMPORI PARCE. TE NOSCE. brev. vit. 2 § 2 *adeo ut quod apud maximum poetarum more* oraculi *dictum est,* verum *esse non dubitem.* Philostr. Apoll. I 17 § 1 *ὥσπερ ἐκ τρίποδος, ὅτε διαλέγοιτο, "οἶδα" ἔλεγε καὶ "δοκεῖ μοι" καὶ "ποῖ φέρεσθε;" καὶ "χρὴ εἰδέναι."* Eunap. vit. soph. p. 473 25 (of Maximus) *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἴ τις τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων πάνυ καὶ δεινῶν διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀντιλέγειν ἐτόλμα, ἀλλ' ἡσυχῇ παραδόντες αὑτούς, τοῖς λεγομένοις ὥσπερ ἐκ τριπόδων εἵποντο.* Friedländer cites Galen XVI 457 L. Martius, a man of note, who had suffered much from physicians, cured by following Galen's orders: *ὅπερ ἐκεῖνος ποιῶν τὴν ἐμὴν φωνὴν ἐκ τρίποδος χρυσηλάτου εἶναι καὶ νῦν φησι.* Athen. 37ᵉ *ἐκ τρίποδος λέγειν φαμὲν τοὺς ἀληθεύοντας.*

127 128 SI NEMO TRIBUNAL VENDIT Sen. ben. I 9 § 4 f. provincias spoliari et nummarium tribunal *audita utrimque licitatione alteri addici non mirum, quoniam quae emeris* vendere *gentium ius est.*

128 ACERSECOMES Ellis on Catullus LXI 131 135.

SI NULLUM IN CONIUGE CRIMEN see esp. Sen. contr. IX 2 (25), of which the theme is: *Flamininus proconsul inter cenam a meretrice rogatus, quae aiebat se numquam vidisse hominem decollari, unum ex damnatis occidit. accusatur maiestatis.* e.g. § 7 *et meretrix praetori, praetor provinciae imperat.* Sen. cons. Helv. 19 § 6 (of his aunt, Helvia's sister) *post hoc nemo miratur, quod per sedecim annos, quibus Aegyptum maritus eius obtinuit, numquam in publico conspecta est, neminem provincialem*

domum suam admisit, nihil a viro petiit, nihil a se peti passa est...multum erat, si per sedecim annos illam provincia probasset: plus est, quod ignoravit. Tac. an. IV 19 20 Silius and his wife Sosia: *nec dubie repetundarum criminibus haerebant.* XVI 32 pr. *loquentis adhuc verba excipit Soranus proclamatque non illam* < his daughter > *in provinciam secum profectam.*

129 130 CURVIS UNGUIBUS...RAPTURA in same place XIII 169 170 raptus...curvis | unguibus *a saeva fertur grue.* Aululariа (Querolus) p. 32 14 Peiper *digitos ad praedam exacuunt* curvis *timendos* unguibus. Lucian Toxaris 14 *ἡ δὲ... παραλαβοῦσα εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ἁπλοϊκὸν....νεανίσκον οὐκ ἀνῆκεν ἐκ τῶν ὀνύχων.*

130 CELAENO so Plut. Lucull. 7 § 5 calls the Roman usurers and *publicani* the harpies of Asia, *οὓς ὕστερον μὲν ὥσπερ Ἁρπυίας τὴν τροφὴν ἁρπάζοντας αὐτῶν ὁ Λούκουλλος ἐξήλασε.*

131 cf. 14 n. 42 n. 56 n. LICET A PICO NUMERES GENUS Suet. Vesp. 12 *quin et conantes quosdam originem Flavii generis ad conditores Reatinos comitemque Herculis, cuius monimentum exstat Salaria via, referre irrisit ultro.*

134 SUMITO Ov. tr. IV 3 72 *estŏ.* Grat. cyn. 56 *reponitŏ.* Calp. V 24 *mittitŏ.* Sen. Troad. 1022—3 *removetŏ.*

136 FRANGIS 247. VIRGAS Heitland on Cic. p. C. Rabir. § 12.

138 INCIPIT Sen. ben. I 11 § 6 f. *maledictum enim* incipit *esse, non munus, in quo vitium accipientis agnoscitur.*

139 CLARAMQUE FACEM PRAEFERRE PUDENDIS VM. III 3 E § 7 f. (al. III 4 § 1) *evenit ut...generosissimarum imaginum fetus in aliquod revoluti dedecus* acceptam a maioribus lucem in tenebras convertant. cf. III 5 § 1 f. Plin. pan. 83 § 1 *habet hoc primum magna fortuna, quod nihil tectum, nihil occultum esse patitur: principum vero non modo domos sed cubicula ipsa intimosque secessus recludit omniaque arcana noscenda famae proponit atque explicat.* For *praeferre* cf. Cic. r. p. I § 52 *nec leges inponit populo, quibus ipse non pareat, sed suam vitam ut legem* praefert *suis civibus.*

140 CONSPECTIUS Ernesti on Suet. Claud. 4.

140 141 cited by William of Tyre VII 1.

142 QUO MIHI TE SOLITUM Ov. am. III 8 47 48 quo tibi

turritis incingere *moenibus urbes?* | quo tibi *discordes* addere *in arma manus?* Pont. I 5 67 quo mihi *diversum fama* contendere *in orbem?*

145 TEMPORA SANTONICO VELAS ADOPERTA CUCULLO Cic. cited on ver. 158. Sen. ep. 114 § 6 (of Maecenas) *non statim, cum haec legeris, hoc tibi occurret, hunc esse...qui in tribunali, in rostris, in omni publico coetu sic adparuerit, ut* pallio velaretur caput *exclusis utrimque auribus, non aliter quam in mimo divites fugitivi solent?* Suet. Cal. 11 *naturam tamen saevam et probrosam ne tunc quidem inhibere poterat, quin...ganeas atque adulteria* capillamento celatus *et veste longa noctibus obiret.* The opposite habit Plaut. capt. 475 *de foro tam* aperto capite *ad lenones eunt.* Petron. 57 *homo inter homines sum,* capite aperto *ambulo.*

146 MAIORUM CINERES Prop. IV 11 37 *testor* maiorum cineres *tibi, Roma, verendos.*

147 CARPENTO Saglio in Daremberg-Saglio s.v.

147 148 IPSE, IPSE V 112 n. p. 430. Stat. Th. IX 137—8 *hanc tibi* Tydeus, | Tydeus *ipse rapit.*

149 LUNA VIDET Commodus (A.D. 192) chose nights free from this celestial espionage DCass. LXXII 17 § 1 *καὶ ἐν μὲν τῷ δημοσίῳ οὐδαμόθεν ἅρματα ἤλασε, πλὴν εἰ μή που ἐν ἀσελήνῳ νυκτί, ἐπιθυμήσας μὲν καὶ δημοσίᾳ ἁρματηλατῆσαι, αἰσχυνθεὶς δὲ καὶ ὀφθῆναι τοῦτο ποιῶν· οἴκοι δὲ συνεχῶς τοῦτ' ἔπραττε, τῇ πρασίνῳ σκευῇ χρώμενος.*

151 152 CLARA LATERANUS LUCE FLAGELLUM SUMET Suet. Caes. 39 *circensibus...quadrigas bigasque et equos desultorios agitaverunt nobilissimi iuvenes.* Aug. 43 *in circo aurigas..., et non numquam ex nobilissima iuventute, produxit.* Calig. 18 *edidit et circenses plurimos a mane ad vesperam, interiecta modo Africanarum venatione modo Troiae* (DCass. LIX 7 § 4) *decursione, et quosdam praecipuos, minio et chrysocolla constrato circo,* nec ullis nisi ex senatorio ordine aurigantibus. Tac. XV 44 f. *hortos ei spectaculo* <the persecution of Christians> *Nero obtulerat et circense ludicrum edebat,* habitu aurigae *permixtus plebi vel curriculo insistens.* Lamprid. Comm. 2 § 8 *aurigae habitu currus rexit.* These passages indeed (like those cited on ver. 153) refer to public spectacles, whereas the text

describes the individual freaks of a noble Automedon (I 59—62 n.), but genuine Roman sentiment would be outraged by a Four-in-Hand Club nearly as much as by noble steeplechasers or jockeys. Fashion however prevailed over the traditional *gravitas morum*, so that it could even be said of Domitius, Nero's grandfather (Suet. 4), non minus aurigandi arte in adulescentia clarus *quam deinde ornamentis triumphalibus ex Germanico bello*. Women 'whips' Prop. IV 8 21—23. Ov. am. II 16 49 50.

153 VIRGA III 317 n. p. 392. Curt. VII 4 § 18 *nobilis equus umbra quoque* virgae *regitur*. Sil. III 293 *doctus* virgae *sonipes*.

154 HORDEA see my Latin Heptateuch p. 212. Food of the poor Wetstein and Kypke on John 6 9. Athen. 457ᵃ interpreting an epigram of Simonides: absent members of his chorus fined a measure of barley for the ass which carried water for them (*παρέχειν τῷ ὄνῳ χοίνικα κριθῶν... Παροπηιάδην δὲ <εἶναι> τὸν ὄνον, μέγα δὲ δεῖπνον τὴν χοίνικα τῶν κριθῶν*). Caes. b. c. III 47 § 7 barley as famine rations. 58 §§ 3—5 for the horses. So Libanus, mounted on Argyrippus, threatens him with short commons, if he does not mend his pace (Plaut. asin. 706) *demam hercle iam tibi de* hordeo, *tolutim ni badizas*. Veget. mulomed. IV (III) praef. § 4 *unde enim* equis hordeum, *unde cibum canibus, unde porcis pabulum dominorum sollertia ministraret, ni pararentur boum labore frumenta?* One kind of barley is called *cantherinum* by Columella and Palladius. In Colum. VI 30 § 1 a horse in poor condition is plumped up by parched wheat and wine; when the cure is complete, beans and *purum hordeum* (as opposed to a mixture of barley and bran) form the fodder. See Daremberg-Saglio *aes hordearium* and *cibaria* (p. 1143). Epictet. III 14 § 12 (cited on 57).

157 EPONAM H. Jordan de genii et Eponae picturis Pompeianis nuper detectis. Romae. 1872. 8vo. (repr. from Bull. inst. arch. di Roma 1872 p. 47 seq.). Una rarissima statua della dea Epona (ib. LIII, 1881, pp. 239—248, with plates). A Celtic word (cf. Eponina, Eporedia, Eporedorix). *ŏ* as in *Divŏna*. Bull. 1866 tav. K n. 3. Fea in Bianconi's Cerchi tav. XVI. Jahrb. des Vereins v. Alterthumsfr. im Rheinl. 1842 189. 1843

43. 1858 91 seq. Orelli inscr. 1355 (= CIL VII 1114). 1745. Henzen 5239. CIL III 1152. 4784. Brambach CIR 464—5. 683. The patron of stalls, as kitchens also, ovens, baths, prisons, had their presiding *genius*. In a Pompeian wall-painting Epona is seated on a mule, nursing a child; elsewhere standing or sitting between two mules and stroking them (Preller-Jordan röm. Myth. II^3 227—8). De Vit onomasticon omits a passage very apposite to our text, for it describes the idlers in the circus, Amm. XXVIII 4 § 30 *inter quos hi qui ad satietatem vixerunt, potiores auctoritate longaeva,* per *Ianos et* Eponam *clamitant saepe, rem publicam stare non posse, si futura concertatione, quem quisque vindicat, carceribus non exsiluerit princeps, et funalibus equis parum cohaerenter circumflexerit metam.*

158 PERVIGILES POPINAS Stat. s. IV 5 13 *non parca tellus* pervigil *et focus.* POPINAS Dionysius at Corinth drank (Plut. vit. Timol. 4 § 3) *κεκραμένον ἀπὸ τῶν καπηλείων.* Cicero (in Pis. § 67) reproaches Piso with drawing his supplies from the shops: *pistor domi nullus, nulla cella; panis et vinum a propola atque de cupa.* Suet. Claud. 40 (and Casaubon) *sermonis vero rerumque tantam saepe neglegentiam ostendit, ut nec quis inter quos, quove tempore ac loco verba faceret, scire aut cogitare existimaretur. cum de laniis ac vinariis ageretur, exclamavit in curia: "Rogo vos, quis potest sine offula vivere?" descripsitque abundantiam veterum tabernarum, unde solitus esset vinum olim et ipse petere.* cf. Suet. Nero 26 cited on 145. Reimar on DCass. LXII 14 § 2. Antiochus Epiphanes had the same mania for tavern society (Ath. 439).

159 SYROPHOENIX (cf. *Συροκίλικες*), see Nöldeke in Hermes V 467. Keim Gesch. Jesu v. Nazara II 535 cites DS. XIX 93 § 7 *Φοινίκη Συρία.* Iust. Trypho 78 *Συροφοινίκη.* Tert. ap. 5 (after Hdt. III 91 § 1. IV 39 § 2) *Syria Palaestina.*

161 HOSPITIS Sen. ben. I 14 § 1 *beneficium qui quibuslibet, dat nulli gratum: nemo se stabularii aut cauponis* hospitem *iudicat.* Eunap. vit. soph. p. 463 26 Didot *εἰς τὸ πολυτελέστερον ὠθεῖται τῶν καπηλείων καὶ ξηρός τε εἶναι, πολλὴν ἀνύσας ὁδόν, ἔφασκεν καὶ ὑπὸ δίψους αὐτίκα μάλα ἀποπνίξεσθαι, καὶ γλυκὺν ἠρτυμένον ἐγχεῖν ἐκέλευσε τὸν οἶνον καὶ προέκειτο τὸ ἀργύριον. ἡ δὲ προεστῶσα τοῦ καπηλείου τὸ*

κέρδος ὁρῶσα πρὸς τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν παρεσκευάζετο καὶ διετρόχαζεν (cf. *currit* here)...προθεμένης αὐτῆς κύλικα τῷ Αἰγυπτίῳ καὶ τὸν ἠρτυμένον οἶνον καταχεομένης, she is called upon to discharge the office of a midwife. On her return, her customer's wrath, who has had to wait for the hot water, passes into great excitement on hearing the landlady's excuse; he is an astrologer: "Go, tell the mother that she has barely missed giving birth to a king, ὅτι μικροῦ βασιλέα τέτοκε."

HOSPITIS ADFECTU Plin. ep. III 10 § 3 n. IV 19 § 1 *nec tantum amitae ei* adfectum *verum etiam patris amissi repraesentes.* Rufin. comm. in symb. apost. 20 f. *bene autem mercedem suam dixit velut imputantis et exprobrantis* adfectu. Ambr. hexaëm. VI § 5 hospitalitatis adfectu (an interesting paragraph, when compared with the *cena* of Trimalchio).

DOMINUM REGEMQUE SALUTAT Cic. off. III § 28 f. *haec enim una virtus* <iustitia> *omnium est* domina et regina *virtutum.* Tusc. II § 47 *praesto est* domina *omnium* et regina *ratio.* Verr. III § 71 *dissimulate, si potestis, vos intellegere ipsum praetorem...redemptorem decumarum atque adeo aratorum* dominum ac regem *fuisse.* Ov. am. III 7 11 12 *et mihi blanditias dixit* dominum*que vocavit,* | *et quae praeterea publica verba iuvant.* Mart. XIV 76 1 *pica loquax certa* dominum *te voce* saluto. Wopkens on Iustin XLII 3 § 4 *quique memores Italicae originis exercitum Cn. Pompei bello Mithridatico fratres* salutavere. So ib. I 10 § 9. XI 2 § 3 *regem.* Sil. XVI 279 *regem appellant* regemque salutant. Amm. XIV 6 § 6 (of Rome) *per omnes tamen quotquot sunt partes terrarum, ut* domina *suscipitur* et regina. See my n. in Latin Heptateuch p. 50 Gen. 996 dominum...salutat.

163 the rhetorical figure *occupatio* as I 150.

163 164 FECIMUS ET NOS HAEC IUVENES Cic. p. Cael. §§ 42 43 e.g. *detur aliquid aetati; sit adulescentia liberior.* cf. Suet. Nero 26 pr. e.g. *naturae illa vitia, non aetatis esse.* The classical apologist for 'wild oats' is Micio (Ter. ad. 100—110. 681—8 *iam id peccatum primum magnum, magnum, at humanum tamen:* | fecere alii saepe item boni).

164 ESTO example of *concessio* (συγχώρησις) of which the type in Halm rhet. lat. 74 16 is Aen. X 67 68 esto: | *Cassandrae impulsus furiis.*

165 ERROREM Tac. XIV 14 (of Nero) *vetus illi cupido erat curriculo quadrigarum insistere, nec minus* foedum studium *cithara ludicrum in modum canere.*

168 INSCRIPTAQUE LINTEA answered the purpose of modern sign boards. A pork-butcher exhibits five hams in a row; another sign represents a draper's shop (Friedländer SG. I^5 269).

169 170 ARMENIAE SYRIAEQUE...RHENO ATQUE HISTRO 51 n. 265 n. Mommsen's volume on the provinces supplies the best comment on these words. Sen. ep. 89 § 20 *illustrium fluminum per privata decursus est et amnes magni* magnarumque gentium termini *usque ad ostium a fonte vestri sunt.* Tac. G. 37 reckons from the invasion of the Cimbri to the second consulship of Trajan 210 years; *tam diu Germania vincitur.* Comparing the Roman reverses in battle with the Germans and the Parthians he sums up thus: *regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas.* Philo legat. ad Gaium 2 (II 547 M) Rhine and Euphrates. To Philomusus, a retailer of false news, Martial says (IX 35 3 4) *scis, quid in Arsacia Pacorus deliberet aula,* | *Rhenanam numeras Sarmaticamque manum.* Plin. pan. 14 pr. *non incunabula haec tibi, Caesar, et rudimenta, cum puer admodum* Parthica *lauro gloriam patris augeres nomenque* Germanici *iam tum mererere, cum ferociam superbiamque* Parthorum *ex proximo auditus magno terrore cohiberes* Rhenumque et Euphraten *admirationis tuae societate coniungeres?* Corbulo had also served in Germany and Syria (Schiller's Nero 96). Ios. bell. III 1 § 2 Vespasian's successes in Germany and Britain marked him out for command against the revolted Jews. The terror of the Parthian horse is vividly portrayed in the apocalypse (see Hausrath, neutestl. Zeitgesch. I^2 50 and esp. Schürer).

174 FURIBUS AC FUGITIVIS Plaut. Poen. 832 furem *an* fugitivom. Salvian gub. IV § 13 *ex servis enim* fures ac fugitivi *sunt.*

175 FABROS SANDAPILARUM in one word σοροποιούς Poll. X 31. Luc. VIII 736 follows Horace: *da* vilem *Magno plebeii funeris* arcam.

176 TYMPANA Ael. v. h. IX 8. Mart. XIV 204 the starving Gallus sells his *cymbala.* Maecenas fr. 4 (PL fr. p. 339 Bährens in Diomed. 514 K) '*ades*' *inquit* '*o Cybebe, fera montium dea,* |

ades et sonante typano *quate flexibile caput.*' DH. II 19 § 4. Lobeck Aglaopham. 307—8.

GALLI Beside Lucretius and Catullus, Varro fr. Eumen., Maecenas, Ov. f. IV 179—372 gave descriptions of their worship. The fullest extant is in Apul. (cited). The Romans were forbidden to take a part (DH. II 19 § 5. VM. VII 7 § 6). cf. Marquardt Stv. III² 367—374. Preller-Jordan röm. Myth. II³ 59—60, 387—9, 398. Daremberg-Saglio *Cybele.* Rapp in Roscher lex. Myth. *Attis.* Movers die Phönizier I 679. Even in Augustine's time (C.D. VII 26) they were seen in Carthage. De Vit lexicon (and onomast. p. 197 b).

177 AEQUA IBI LIBERTAS Sen. n. q. IV 3 § 6 *inter nullos magis quam inter philosophos debet esse* aequa libertas.

COMMUNIA POCULA cf. Plin. ep. II 6 § 3 cited on V 9.

180 NEMPE IN LUCANOS AUT TUSCA ERGASTULA MITTAS Trimalchio had given offence to his master (Petr. 69): *ideo me* in vilicationem relegavit. Quintil. II 8 § 7 *ut nonnulli fortasse* rus mittendi. In a true story (Tert. ad nat. I 16 f.) which might have been taken (as Tertullian remarks) from a mime or comedy, a kidnapped Roman boy is sold in Asia, and finally brought to the Roman market and bought by his own father. *dehinc, ut suerat,* adulescentem dominus in agrum et vincula legat. Basil hom. in martyrem Iulittam 6 (II 39ᶜ) every one has cause for gratitude. Art thou a slave? Yet there are others in a worse plight; give thanks because thou art not condemned in the mill, art not flogged. Art thou in fetters or in the stocks? Then be grateful for life. dig. VII 1 15 § 1 slaves whose services are bequeathed to any one, must be employed according to their condition: *nam si librarium* rus mittat et qualum et calcem portare *cogat, histrionem balneatorem faciat, vel de palaestra stercorandis latrinis praeponat, abuti videbitur proprietate.* Becker-Göll Gallus II 173—175, III 51.

ERGASTULA Marquardt PrL. 155. 180. Sagittarius on Iustin I 6 § 2. Flor. III 19 § 3 (of Sicily) *hic ad culturam agri frequentia* ergastula *catenatique cultores materiam bello praebuere.* cf. on the risk of these armies of slaves 12 § 10 *bella servilia unde nobis nisi ex abundantia familiarum?* Sen. clem. I 24 § 1 *dicta*

est aliquando a senatu sententia, ut servos a liberis cultus distingueret. deinde adparuit, quantum periculum immineret, si servi nostri numerare nos coepissent.

181 TROIUGENAE Liv. XXXVII 37 §§ 2 3 (of P. Scipio, B.C. 190) *inde Ilium processit, castrisque in campo, qui est subiectus moenibus, positis, in urbem arcemque cum ascendisset, sacrificavit Minervae praesidi arcis, et* Iliensibus *in omni rerum verborumque honore* ab se oriundos Romanos praeferentibus et Romanis laetis origine sua. XXXVIII 39 § 10 B.C. 188 Iliensibus *Rhoeteum et Gergithum addiderunt, non tam ob recentia ulla merita, quam* originum *memoria. eadem et Dardanum liberandi causa fuit.* Suet. Claud. 25 *Iliensibus, quasi Romanae gentis auctoribus, tributa in perpetuum remisit.* Nero 31 f. Nero induced to dig for Dido's buried treasures. dig. XXVII 1 17 § 1 Iliensibus *et propter inclitam nobilitatem civitatis et* propter coniunctionem originis Romanae *iam antiquitus et senatus consultis et constitutionibus principum plenissima immunitas tributa est, ut etiam tutelae excusationem habeant, scilicet eorum pupillorum, qui Ilienses non sint; idque Divus Pius rescripsit.*

182 VOLESOS Ov. Pont. III 2 105 *quos* Volesus *patrii cognoscat nominis auctor.*

184 UTIMUR EXEMPLIS Cic. Ov. Tac. in Mühlmann *exemplum* col. 951 f.

185 VOCEM LOCASTI Sen. Herc. fur. 172—5 *hic clamosi rabiosa fori | iurgia* vendens *improbus* iras | et verba locat.

187 LAUREOLUM VELOX ETIAM BENE LENTULUS EGIT Antonius followed Cleopatra about the streets of Alexandria dressed as a slave-girl, in quest of adventures (Plut. Ant. 29 § 1).

188 IUDICE ME Ov. Pont. I 5 15 16 *cum relego, scripsisse pudet, quia plurima cerno |* me *quoque, qui feci,* iudice *digna lini.* VM. III 7 E § 6 *Marte ipso* iudice. Verg. Hor. cet.

DIGNUS CRUCE Gell. XX 4 'artificum scaenicorum studium amoremque inhonestum probrosumque esse.' See Liban. or. 63 (III 345—395) in defence of public dancers, in reply to a lost piece of Aristides.

189 POPULI FRONS DURIOR Ter. eun. IV 7 36 (= 806) Ruhnken *os* durum. Ov. Pont. I 1 80 *plus isto,* duri, *si*

precer, oris *ero*. Sen. const. sap. 17 § 3 *si hoc potuit ille* duritia oris, *qui assiduis convitiis depudere didicerat.*

190 QUI SEDET ET SPECTAT Iuv., I think, nowhere rebukes a far more demoralising spectacle, than the exhibition in their true colours of degenerate nobles;—I mean the condemnation of Christian and other convicts to public torture for the diversion of a crowded theatre (Plut. de sera num. vind. 9 p. 554, a parallel to the mockery at the Passion): *οὐδὲν ἔνιοι διαφέρουσι παιδαρίων, ἃ τοὺς κακούργους ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις θεώμενα πολλάκις ἐν χιτῶσι διαχρύσοις καὶ χλαμυδίοις ἁλουργοῖς ἐστεφανωμένους καὶ πυρριχίζοντας, ἄγαται καὶ τέθηπεν, ὡς μακαρίους· ἄχρις οὗ κεντούμενοι καὶ μαστιγούμενοι καὶ πῦρ ἀνιέντες ἐκ τῆς ἀνθινῆς ἐκείνης καὶ πολυτελοῦς ἐσθῆτος ὀφθῶσιν.* Apul. met. IV 13 commendation of the liberality of a noble who *digno fortunae suae splendore publicas voluptates instruebat.* Among the actors were *noxii perdita securitate suis epulis bestiarum saginas instruentes.* X 34. Friedländer SG. II[6] 406—9. Suet. Cal. 29 five *retiarii* had yielded without a struggle to as many *secutores;* the order was given to slay them; one of the number taking up his trident slew all the conquerors: *hanc ut crudelissimam caedem et deflevit edicto et eos, qui* spectare sustinuissent, *exsecratus est.*

192 ALAPAS Chrys. hom. 37 (38) in Matt. c. 6 (VII 422[d]) a youth personating a girl; *ἄλλος δέ τις γεγηρακὼς ὑπεναντίας τούτῳ τὰς τρίχας ξυρῷ περιελὼν καὶ ἐζωσμένος τὰς πλευράς, πρὸ τῶν τριχῶν ἐκτεμὼν τὴν αἰδῶ, πρὸς τὸ ῥαπίζεσθαι ἕτοιμος ἕστηκε, πάντα λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν παρεσκευασμένος.* Greg. Naz. or. 43 (= 20; on Basil) c. 64 (I 820[a]) *καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς θαυμάζοι ὡς ἡδεῖς τε καὶ φιλανθρώπους, ὅτι τοῖς δήμοις χαρίζονται καὶ κινοῦσι γέλωτα τοῖς ἐπὶ κόρρης ῥαπίσμασι καὶ ψοφήμασι.*

194 NEC DUBITANT CELSI PRAETORIS VENDERE LUDIS Bücheler in Rhein. Mus. XXXV 395—6: "viri senatorii ordinis operam ad scaenam non tantum Caesari locant sed etiam equestri loco natis. *celsus* proprie eques dicitur: ut vetera praeteream, Statius s. I < 4 39 > *patrumque equitumque luctum* explicans ver. 41 *non labente Numa timuit sic curia felix, Pompeio nec* celsus eques, ibidem III 3 143 de Claudio

Etrusco quem Vespasianus anulo aureo donatum ex libertino ordine in equestrem traduxerat *atque idem in cuneos populum cum duxit* equestres, | *mutavitque genus laevaeque ignobile ferrum* | *exuit, et* celse natorum *aequavit honori.* itaque celsus praetor a Iuvenale appellatur ex equestri nobilitate adeptus senatorium ordinem, in quo mimi isti erant nati."

195 FINGE TAMEN GLADIOS INDE ATQUE HINC PULPITA PONI VII 113—4 hinc . . *parte alia.* VI 436—7 inde...*atque alia in parte.* Amm. XXXI 10 § 8 hinc indeque. On *hinc et inde* (Silver Age use) see Bugge de elocutione Suet. (Upsala 1875) 65. Hand, Tursellinus III 635—6. Mühlmann, *inde* col. 634—5.

196 QUID SATIUS? Fabri on Liv. XXI 39 § 6. Nipperdey on Tac. l. c. and on Nep. Hannibal 13 § 4. Sen. exc. contr. X 6 § 1. Mart. I 6 5. Sil. IX 638. Tert. de an. 13. Avian 4 3. Aug. conf. I § 22 f. Dräger, hist. Synt. I² 103. QUISQUAM Burman on Aen. I 48, citing Passerat on Prop. p. 392.

198 199 RES HAUT MIRA TAMEN CITHAROEDO PRINCIPE MIMUS NOBILIS DCass. LXIII 1 § 1 (A.D. 66) *ὅ τε γὰρ Νέρων ἐν τοῖς κιθαρῳδοῖς ἠγωνίσατο, καὶ νικητήρια αὐτῷ Μενεκράτους τοῦ τῆς κιθαρῳδίας διδασκάλου ἐν τῷ ἱπποδρόμῳ ποιήσαντος ἡνιόχησε.* esp. Suet. Nero 25. Suet. Cal. 11 Caligula, before he came to the throne, *naturam . . probrosam ne tunc quidem inhibere poterat, quin...scaenicas saltandi canendique artes studiosissime appeteret.* The false Nero relied on this credential Tac. h. II 8 citharae *et cantus peritus, unde illi super similitudinem oris propior ad fallendum fides.* A later Pseudonero, Terentius Maximus, resembled Nero in form and voice (Zonar. XI 18, I 678ᶜ). *καὶ γὰρ ἐκιθαρῴδει.* Suet. Ner. 11 *ludi maximi,* wherein *ex utroque ordine et sexu plerique ludicras partes sustinuerunt.* Plut. coniug. praec. 17 p. 140 *οἱ φιλόμουσοι τῶν βασιλέων πολλοὺς μουσικοὺς ποιοῦσιν.* With the juxtaposition *citharoedo principe* cf. VI 118 *meretrix Augusta.*

MIMUS NOBILIS Ov. tr. II 497 mimos obscaena iocantes. 498—514. 515 *scribere si fas est* imitantes turpia mimos. Caligula was devoted to dancers, as to charioteers and gladiators, and once sent by night for the leading senators, to exhibit his skill as a dancer (DCass. LIX 5 §§ 2 5. cf. 29 § 6. Philo leg. ad Gai. 7 II 552 M). Suet. Nero 4 Nero's grandfather, Domitius,

praeturae consulatusque honore equites Romanos matronasque ad agendum mimum *produxit in scaenam.* 16 f. pantomimorum *factiones cum ipsis simul relegatae.* cf. Tac. an. XIII 25 f. he was driven to this measure by the riots provoked by previous licence. Towards the end of his life Nero (Suet. 54) vowed that he would celebrate his anticipated victory by dancing the Turnus of Virgil. Pantomimes forbidden by Domitian, restored by Nerva, forbidden again by Trajan (Plin. pan. 46. cf. DCass. LXVII 13 § 1, A.D. 94). cf. Suet. Nero 12 *pyrrichae.* Mart. III 86 3 4 *sed si Panniculum spectas et, casta, Latinum,* | *non sunt haec mimis improbiora—lege.*

199 HAEC ULTRA QUID ERIT NISI LUDUS? cf. Tac. XIV 20 (cited on 193) *quid superesse nisi ut* cet.? Sen. n. q. VII 32 § 3 *sub persona* (theatrical mask) *cum diu trita frons est, transitur ad galeam* (of the gladiator). *ultra* in anastrophe also XIV 212. XVI 26. *intra* VIII 240. Iuv. uses no other prep. after its case (Kiaer 58. on *ultra* in anastrophe see Archiv f. lat. Lexik. IV 257).

LUDUS for early examples of freeborn gladiators see Cic. de or. III § 86. p. Sest. § 9. Prop. IV 8 25. Hor. ep. I 18 36 (Friedländer SG. II^6 319, 370, where he cites inscriptions and *tesserae gladiatoriae.* 372). Iulius Caesar himself is mainly responsible for the fashion (Suet. 26): *tirones neque in ludo neque per lanistas, sed in domibus per equites Romanos atque etiam per senatores, precibus enitens, quod epistulis eius ostenditur, ut disciplinam singulorum susciperent ipsique dictata exercentibus darent.* Suet. Cal. 32 mirmillonem e ludo, *rudibus secum battuentem et sponte prostratum, confodit ferrea sica ac more victorum cum palma discucurrit.* id. Nero 12 *exhibuit autem ad ferrum quadringentos (?) senatores sexcentosque equites Romanos, et quosdam fortunae atque existimationis integrae.* Lamprid. Commodus 5 §§ 5 6.

200 DEDECUS Tac. XV 65 (cited on 198). ib. 32 f. *spectacula gladiatorum idem annus habuit pari magnificentia ac priora; sed feminarum illustrium senatorumque plures per harenam foedati* (cf. Tac. h. II 62 cited on 199) *sunt.*

207 208 SE PORRIGAT Ov. tr. III 11 5 6 *quis gradus ulterior, tua quo* se porrigat *ira* | *restat?* Sen. vit. be. 8 § 4 *idem*

nostra mens faciat cum secuta sensus suos, per illos se *ad externa* porrexerit. Iustin XXXIX 5 § 3 *iam enim fortuna Romana* porrigere se *ad orientalia regna, non contenta Italiae terminis, coeperat.* Mamertin. grat. act. Iuliano (= pan. 11) § 15 f. *neque enim ultra praefecturam* se *votorum meorum modestia* porrigebat.

209 IGNOMINIAM Sen. prov. 2 § 3 *athletas videmus, quibus virium cura est, cum fortissimis quibusque confligere et exigere ab his per quos certamini praeparantur, ut totis contra ipsos viribus utantur. caedi se vexarique patiuntur et, si non inveniunt singulos pares, pluribus simul obiciuntur.*

211 212 QUIS TAM PERDITUS UT DUBITET SENECAM PRAEFERRE NERONI? for the turn of expression cf. Sen. prov. 3 § 11 *non usque eo in possessionem generis humani vitia venerunt ut dubium sit, an electione fati data plures nasci Reguli quam Maecenates velint.*

213 214 CUIUS SUPPLICIO NON DEBUIT UNA PARARI SIMIA NEC SERPENS UNUS NEC CULLEUS UNUS XIII 155—6 n. Hence [Dracont.] Orest. trag. 906 cuius in exitium sat erit non culleus unus. Cornif. ad Herenn. I § 23 *lex: qui parentem necasse iudicatus erit, ut is obvolutus et obligatus* corio *devehatur in profluentem.* Sen. exc. contr. V 4 f. *imaginabar mihi* culleum serpentes profundum. DH. I 62 p. 792 R. VM. I 1 § 13. Suet. Claud. 34 *tormenta quaestionum poenasque parricidarum repraesentabat exigebatque coram.* Pacat. 42 pr. 44 pr. Lact. III 14 § 9. Savaro on Sid. ep. IV 23 pp. 299 300.

NON .. UNA ... NEC .. UNUS NEC ... UNUS Mr Walter Headlam ('On editing Aeschylus,' Lond. 1891, pp. 41—44) collects many exx. of *οὐχ εἷς, non unus, οὐχ ἅπαξ, non semel,* in defence of the reading of all editors (except one) in Aesch. s. c. Th. 100. With our text he compares Iuv. III 150. VI 218, and (in some MS. additions for which, as for the essay itself, I am indebted to him) cites Plaut. truc. 868–9 *cogitato mus pusillus quam sit sapiens bestia,* | *aetatem qui* non *cubili* uni *umquam committit suam.* Ov. Pont. III 2 9 *cum feriant unum,* non unum *fulmina terrent.*

215 PAR AGAMEMNONIDAE CRIMEN Nep. Epam. 6 § 1 2 (cf. Plut. II 193^{c} 810^{f}) Callistratus urging the Arcadians to

prefer Athens to Argos, mother of the matricides Orestes and Alcmaeon, and to Thebes, mother of the incestuous parricide Oedipus; Epaminondas (§ 3) *admirari se dixit stultitiam rhetoris Attici, qui non animadverterit innocentes illos natos domi, scelere admisso, cum patria essent expulsi, receptos esse ab Atheniensibus.* Of nine references to Orestes in Halm's rhet. Lat. all but the last bear on the question of justification. In the προγυμνάσματα of Nicolaus VI 12 (Walz rhet. Gr. I 318—9) poetic justice is shewn to be satisfied by the acquittal of Orestes. The most famous appeal to the judgement of Pallas is in Cic. p. Mil. § 8 *an est quisquam qui hoc ignoret, cum de homine occiso quaeratur, aut negari solere omnino esse factum aut recte et iure factum esse defendi? . . . . itaque hoc iudices non sine causa etiam fictis fabulis doctissimi homines memoriae prodiderunt, eum, qui patris ulciscendi causa matrem necavisset, variatis hominum sententiis non solum divina, sed etiam sapientissimae deae sententia liberatum.* Dinarch. c. Demosth. § 87 the Eumenides themselves acquiesced in the sentence passed on Orestes. Philostr. Apoll. IV 38 § 3 worse than beasts who will not prey on their parents, Nero gluts himself on such food. Orestes also and Alcmaeon slew their mothers, but it was in order to avenge their fathers cet. The fierce pagan Namatianus (II 55—60) would release Nero from his pains to make room for a sinner of blacker dye, Stilicho. *hic immortalem, mortalem perculit ille; | hic mundi matrem perculit, ille suam.*

216 217 ULTOR PATRIS Aristot. rhet. III 2 § 14 Cope καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις ἔστι μὲν τὰς ἐπιθέσεις ποιεῖσθαι ἀπὸ φαύλου ἢ αἰσχροῦ, οἷον ὁ μητροφόντης, ἔστι δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίονος, οἷον ὁ πατρὸς ἀμύντωρ.

220 SCENA DCass. LXIII 9 § 4 (A.D. 67) names Alcmaeon and Orestes as parts played by Nero.

221 TROICA NON SCRIPSIT for climax cf. Dem. 371 20 πανοῦργος καὶ θεοῖς ἐχθρὸς καὶ γραμματεύς. Diodorus (XIV 109 § 5) some detected divine judgement in the shipwreck of a vessel having on board the poems of Dionysius. Nero had as a boy delivered a Greek speech setting forth with much learning the claims of Troy and the Julian house, and obtained for

the Trojans exemption from tribute (Tac. XII 58. Suet. Claud. 25. Nero 7).

VERGINIUS DCass. LXVIII 2 § 4. CIL V (2) 5702

IOVI · O · M
PRO · SALVTE
ET · VICTORIA · L
VERGINI · RVFI
PYLADES · SALTVAR
V · S

'cum formula *pro salute et victoria* non conveniat nisi imperatori et ubi invenitur (vol. II n. 1305. 3032. vol. III n. 1088) ibi ad imperatorem referatur, iure titulum adscribemus anno p. Chr. 69, quo L. Verginius Rufus Vindice devicto a militibus in Gallia imperator appellatus est, sed post diutinas moras (Tac. h. I 8) imperium recusavit; inter eas moras opinor servus eius titulum hunc dedicavit. ceterum cum ex auctoribus constet Rufum oriundum esse ex municipio quod Comensi finitimum erat (Plin. ep. II 1 § 8 *utrique eadem regio, municipia finitima, agri etiam possessionesque coniunctae*), iam recte credi poterit origine Mediolanensis agrosque ibi habuisse, ubi saltuarii eius titulus prodiit, finitimos Plinianis ad Larium lacum.' TH. MOMMSEN. cf. Ephem. epigr. V ind. (mere formal dates).

225 CANTU cf. III 91 n. Even Alexandria could not tolerate a royal Auletes (Strabo 796) ὃς *χωρὶς τῆς ἄλλης ἀσελγείας χοραυλεῖν ἤσκησε, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ γε ἐσεμνύνετο τοσοῦτον, ὥστ' οὐκ ὤκνει συντελεῖν ἀγῶνας ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις, εἰς οὓς παρῄει διαμιλλησόμενος τοῖς ἀνταγωνισταῖς.* so Caligula (Suet. 54). Nero's speech at the Isthmian games A.D. 67 has been discovered by Holleaux on a *stele* in Boeotia (Boissier Acad. d. Inscr. Oct. 1888). Philostr. Apoll. IV 39 § 1 a drunken tramp, singing Nero's songs, and arresting on charge of treason all who refused a fee; he carried in a box two strings from Nero's lute, which he professed to have bought for two minae, and would only sell to a victor in the Pythian games. § 2 beginning with a short hymn of Nero's, he went on with odes from his Orestea and Antigone. ib. 42 § 1 Demetrius the Cynic

would have been executed for his free criticism of the cost of Nero's gymnasium; *ἐφ' οἷς ξυνήρατο αὐτῷ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτίκα τὸ τὸν Νέρωνα εὐφωνότατα ἑαυτοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ᾄδειν. ἤδε δ' ἐν καπηλείῳ πεποιημένῳ εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον διάζωμα ἔχων γυμνός, ὥσπερ τῶν καπήλων οἱ ἀσελγέστατοι.* dig. XLVIII 5 24 pr. among those adulterers whom the husband might legally kill, e.g. slaves, or the freedmen of the family, are reckoned *qui leno fuerit, quive artem ludicram... fecerit,* in scenam saltandi cantandive causa prodierit, *iudiciove publico damnatus neque in integrum restitutus erit.*

226 APIUM Ios. c. Ap. I 30 (cited XIV 101 n. p. 308). Paus. VIII 48 § 2.

228 THYESTAE a Thyestean meal in Iustin I 5 § 6.

231 CATILINA his high birth proverbial Cornelius Severus in Sen. suas. 6 § 30 *patricium nefas.*

232 233 ARMA NOCTURNA ET FLAMMAS PARATIS Cic. de divin. I 21 ver. 64 65 *et clades patriae* flamma *ferroque* parata | *vocibus Allobrogum patribus populoque patebat.* Catil. I § 6 *muta iam istam mentem, mihi crede, obliviscere caedis atque* incendiorum. § 8 *quid? cum te Praeneste Kalendis ipsis Novembribus occupaturum* nocturno *impetu esse confideres*—cet. § 9 f. *discripsisti urbis partes ad* incendia...*reperti sunt duo equites Romani, qui...sese illa ipsa* nocte *paulo ante lucem me in meo lectulo interfecturos...pollicerentur.* de harusp. resp. § 18 f. the augurs 'not obscurely' foretold *hanc recentem urbis* inflammandae *delendique imperii coniurationem.* Prud. c. Symm. I 526—532 *nec tantum* Arpinas consul *tibi, Roma, medelae* | *contulit extincto iusta inter vincla* Cethego, | *quantum praecipuus nostro sub tempore princeps* | *prospexit tribuitque boni: multos* Catilinas | *ille domo pepulit, non saeva* incendia *tectis* | *aut sicas patribus, sed tartara nigra animabus* | *internoque hominum statui tormenta* parantes.

234 BRACATORUM SENONUMQUE see Desjardins, Gaules. on the destruction of Rome G. Thourot in the 11th Suppl. (1880) to Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, 93—188. Th. Mommsen's röm. Forschungen II (Berl. 1879) 221—381. Tac. XV 42 f. some noted that Nero's fire broke out on the 18th of June, *quo et* Senones *captam urbem* inflammaverint. cf. Suet.

Tib. 3. Cal. 51 f. Claud. bell. Get. 291 *haec* <Roma> Senonum *restinxit sanguine* flammas.

235 TUNICA MOLESTA Mart. IV 86 8 *nec scombris* tunicas *dabis* molestas. In anth. Pal. XI 184 a thief is burnt as Hercules. cf. a like sarcastic euphemism in the digest, *mala mansio.*

236 VIGILAT CONSUL the expression became proverbial from Cicero's epigram on the consul suffect of six hours. vigilantem *habemus* consulem *Caninium,* | *qui consulatu somnum non vidit suo* (Macr. Sat. II 3 § 6. VII 3 § 10. Cic. fam. VII 30 § 1. cf. Plut. Caes. 58 § 1. DCass. XLIII 46 § 2—4. Plin. VII § 181. Tac. h. III 37. Suet. Caes. 76. Nero 15. Trebell. Poll. XXX tyr. 8 § 2). Cic. in Catilin. I § 8 *sensistine illam coloniam meo iussu meis praesidiis, custodiis,* vigiliis *esse munitam?*

237 NOVUS ARPINAS [Sall.] decl. in Cic. § 4 (in Baiter and Kayser XI 148) *verum, ut opinor, homo* novus Arpinas. For *novus* cf. Wetstein on Eph. 2 15. for *Arpinas* see De Vit onomasticon. Symm. ep. I 1 (Hortensius) *contra* Arpinatem *qui stetit eloquio.* Cicero (Tusc. V § 66), after narrating his discovery of the tomb of Archimedes, breaks out in a pardonable triumph: *ita nobilissima Graeciae civitas, quondam vero etiam doctissima, sui civis unius acutissimi monumentum ignorasset, nisi ab homine* Arpinate *didicisset.* Mart. X 19 14—17 (of Pliny) *totos dat tetricae dies Minervae,* | *dum centum studet auribus virorum* | *hoc quod saecula posterique possint* | Arpinis *quoque comparare chartis.*

238 MUNICIPALIS EQUES Tac. an. VI 27 *tot luctibus funesta civitate pars maeroris fuit, quod Iulia Drusi filia, quondam Neronis uxor, denupsit in domum Rubellii Blandi, cuius avum Tiburtem* equitem *Romanum plerique meminerant.* Herodian (V 1 §§ 6—8) contrasts the services of emperors like Marcus (Aurelius) and Pertinax, ἐξ ἰδιωτικῶν σπαργάνων ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐλθόντες, with the career of a Commodus or an Antoninus (Caracalla) who treat the empire as a private property, due to them by right of inheritance.

239 ET IN OMNI MONTE LABORAT Jortin cites VFl. I 14 et in omni *turre furentem.*

240 TOGA XVI 45 n. Cic. Cato § 11 *nec vero in armis praestantior quam in* toga. Ov. r. a. 152 *vade per urbanae splendida castra* togae. Tert. de pallio v p. 952 Oehler *plus* togae *laesere rem publicam quam loricae.*

242 243 UDO CAEDIBUS ASSIDUIS GLADIO Sen. brev. vit. 4 § 5 *cum civibus primum, deinde cum collegis, novissime cum adfinibus coactus armis decernere mari terraque sanguinem fudit: per Macedoniam Siciliam Aegyptum Syriam Asiamque et omnes prope oras bello circumactus Romana caede lassos exercitus ad externa bella convertit.*

243 PARENTEM Liv. v 49 § 7 Camillus in his triumph styled by the soldiers a second Romulus and parens patriae. So Fabius (Sil. VIII 2 Drakenborch). Ov. Pont. IV 9 133—4 *auguror his igitur flecti tua numina; nec tu | inmerito nomen mite* parentis *habes.* [Sen.] Octavia 477—8 *sic ille* patriae *primus Augustus* parens | *complexus astra est et colitur templis deus.* 487—490 *plebisque votis atque iudicio patrum | tu pacis auctor, generis humani arbiter | electus orbem iam sacra specie regis* | patriae parens.

244 PATREM PATRIAE Ov. Pont. I 1 36 *at* patriae pater *hic* (Augustus). Petron. 60 *Augusto* patri patriae *feliciter.* cf. Spartian. Hadr. 6 § 4. Capitolin. Pert. 5 § 6. Spartian. Did. Iulian. 4 § 5.

CICERONEM Octavian himself, Nov. 44 B.C., wrote daily to Cicero (Att. XVI 11 § 6), entreating him to save the commonwealth a second time.

245 ARPINAS ALIUS = *alter* 'a second.' In the later Latin the meanings of *alius* and *alter* are confused, or interchanged. see my glossary to Beda and the ind. to my Latin Heptateuch. Benecke on Iustin XXX 4 § 15, where *alteri...alteri* and *alii... alii* are used indiscriminately. Sen. brev. vit. 17 § 6 Marium caliga dimisit, consulatus exercet. Hier. ep. 66 (26) § 7 *quod ante per manus patricias tradebatur et sola nobilitas possidebat, quo* consul Marius, victor Numidiae et Teutonum atque Cimbrorum, ob ignobilitatem familiae putabatur indignus.

247 FRANGEBAT VERTICE VITEM I uphold the usual interpretation of these words, not believing that *vertice* can denote,

without further definition, any head but his who is subject of the verb (cf. III 33 n. p. 185 *praebere caput*); also that *frangebat* and *muniret* must have the same subject. It is not necessary to specify the owner of the *vitis*, the bare word technically denoting the implement of discipline, needing no genitive or possessive pronoun any more than *crux* does. The soldier beaten may be said to break the centurion's cane on his head, just as the centurion may be said to break it on the soldier; in 136 the genitive *sociorum* makes all the difference. The *si lentus* cet. does not imply that Marius was habitually backward in obeying orders; *παθὼν ἔμαθε* that obedience was the best policy. Achilles, even when a strapping lad, had a wholesome awe of Chiron's cane (VII 210—2), but he was not therefore a backward pupil. My friend Prof. Bücheler must allow me to dissent from his view (Rhein. Mus. XXXV 396): "Marius *frangebat vertice vitem, si lentus pigra muniret castra dolabra.* intellegunt militem gregarium vapulare Marium a centurione suo, *frangebat* exponunt *frangi sibi patiebatur* <not so, see above>. incredibile hoc mihi videtur, nam frangit fustem qui percutit et pulsat, non qui patitur verbera < ? cf. VI 479 *hic* frangit ferulas, *rubet ille flagello*>, non qui capite patitur, non qui vetatur obluctari disciplina militari. Iuvenalis supra (136) de proconsule *frangis virgas sociorum in sanguine*, caedit enim per lictores suos magistratus ipse, de centurione Tacitus ann. I 23 *fracta vite in tergo militis alteram poscebat.* nec possunt Iuvenalis verba aliter accipi praesertim cum nihil adiecerit quo verticem quidem Marii esse sed vitem alterius doceremur. denique si lente pigreque Marium induxisset quandocunque militiae munera obeuntem, suam ipse poeta argumentationem confutasset. quamobrem Marium ego intellego strenuum centurionem solitum reprimere militum ignaviam. *verticis* igitur nova quaerenda est interpretatio. fortasse sicut Ammianus civitatis decuriones primarios vertices vocat et exercitus ductores vertices principiorum, sic iam pridem castrensi sermone primos quosque in centuriis milites coeperant appellare vertices. in principales si centurio animadvertit disciplinae lex nullo gradu neglecta, iusta severitate viritim propagata apparet." Such a sense of the singular

vertex is incapable of proof; if granted, it would require the prep. *in*. No. Marius appears first as a ploughman, then as a raw recruit, drilled into shape by the *argumentum ad baculum* (cf. v 154 155, where the monkey recruit fears the lash). On *vitis* cf. Sil. vi 43 Ruperti. xii 465. Dosithei interpretamentorum l. tertius (ed. Böcking, Bonn, 1832, Hadriani sent. 13 p. 18) *κλῆμα λαβὼν ἑκατοντάρχης αὐτῶν γένου.* vite *accepta* centurio *eorum esto.* Macrob. Sat. i 23 § 16 vitem *centurialem.*

249 250 SUMMA PERICULA RERUM EXCIPIT so *excipere fortunam, ictus, vim improborum* (Mühlmann *excipio* col. 917).

252 CADAVERA CORVI Macrob. Sat. vii 5 § 11 no brute as long-lived as man: *nisi recurras forte ad ea, quae de* corvis *atque cornicibus fabulosa dicuntur, quos tamen videmus* omnibus inhiare cadaveribus. Obbar on Hor. ep. i 16 48. Otto, Sprichwörter, *corvus* n. 3. Prud. dipt. 11 12 why the raven did not return to Noah: corvus *enim inglurie per foeda* cadavera *captus* | *haeserat.*

253 LAURO Sil. ix 546 *Libycam feret in Capitolia* laurum. xv 119 120 Dr. laurum*que superbam in gremio Iovis excisis deponere Poenis.* Plin. pan. 8 *adlata erat ex Pannonia laurea: ...hanc imperator Nerva in gremio Iovis collocarat.*

254 DECIORUM ANIMAE Prop. iv (v) 1 45 *tunc* animi *venere* Deci *Brutique secures.* See the fragments of the Aeneadae (or Decius) of L. Attius (Ribbeck fr. trag.² 281—3) e.g. fr. 11 (in Non. 98 11) *patrio exemplo et me dicabo atque animam devoro hostibus.*

257 SUFFICIUNT DIS INFERNIS XII 100 n. 115—120 n. expiatory sacrifices of Theseus (Plut. 17 § 2), Marathus (ibid. 32 § 6), sons of Kronos (Eus. p. e. i 10 §§ 33 34), Kratinos (Ath. 602ᵉᵈ), Codrus (Hor. c iii 19 2), daughters of Erechtheus (Lobeck Aglaoph. 210—1), the Syracusans, penitent after Dion's murder (Nepos Dion 10 § 2 *sic subito misericordia odio successerat, ut eum suo sanguine, si possent, ab Acheronte cuperent redimere*), the daughters of Antipoenos (Paus. ix 17 § 1), victims to avert a pestilence (Quintil. decl. 326. 384). Broukhus. on Tibull. i 5 10. Mayor on Cic. n. d. iii § 15.

259 ANCILLA NATUS except when legal status is in question,

ancilla is the common fem. of *servus* Plaut. trin. 799 Br. Ter. haut. 142. cf. Iustin XXIII 4 §§ 5 6 of the younger Hiero: *maternum illi genus sordidum atque adeo pudibundum fuit. nam* ex ancilla natus *ac propterea a patre velut dehonestamentum generis expositus fuerat.*

262 263 IUVENES IPSIUS CONSULIS ET QUOS DECERET VII 210—2 n. (pp. 459 460). VI 399 *audax* et *coetus* possit quae *ferre virorum.* XIV 52 53. Ov. tr. IV 10 65 66 *molle Cupidineis nec inexpugnabile telis | cor mihi* quodque *levis causa* moveret, *erat.* and so Riese id. met. II 63 64 *ardua prima via est* et qua *vix mane recentes |* enitantur *equi.* Sen. de ira I 17 § 2 *telum...nec anceps* nec quod *in dominum remitti* posset. II 29 § 2 *est aliquis malignus* et qui *amicitias cohaerentes diducere* velit cet. The ind. ib. I 18 § 3 *vir...pravus* et cui placebat *pro constantia rigor.* const. sap. 3 § 2 *res vulgaris* et quae discitur. ep. 71 § 14 *mens hebes* et quae *se corpori* addixit. conj. in Suet. Claud. 25 *ingratos* et de quibus *patroni* quererentur. Vit. 10 *magnifice* et ut...ostenderet. Vesp. 5 *prolixum* et qui...portenderet.

263 MAGNUM ALIQUID Plin. pan. 51 § 2 Schwarz magnum *reicere* aliquid *et amputare ex iis quae princeps tamquam necessaria reliquit.* Pers. I 14 *grande aliquid.*

265 IMPERII FINES TIBERINUM VIRGO NATAVIT Prop. IV (V) 10 24—26 *vincere tum Veios posse laboris erat. | necdum* ultra Tiberim *belli sonus; ultima praeda | Nomentum et captae iugera terna Corae.* Ov. Pont. I 3 81 82 *quid referam veteres Romanae gentis, apud quos | exulibus tellus ultima Tibur erat?* Flor. I 9 § 7 (of the *populus Romanus*) *quippe cui patrii soli glaeba nulla, sed statim hostile pomerium, mediusque inter Latium atque Etruscos quasi in quodam bivio collocatus omnibus portis in hostem incurreret.* Festus p. 213 Müller *cum Etruscorum agrum* a Romano Tiberis discluderet. Livy (III 13 § 10. VIII 14 § 5. 20 § 9. XXVI 34 §§ 7—10) and Gellius (XX 1 § 47) speak of banishment to the other side of the Tiber. cf. Liv. I 3 § 5 *pax ita convenerat, ut* Etruscis Latinisque fluvius Albula, quem nunc Tiberim vocant, finis esset. For the legend see Sil. X 493—499 Dr. XIII 828—830. Claud. in Eutr. I 447.

267 MATRONIS LUGENDUS Sen. ep. 63 § 13 *annum feminis ad lugendum constituere maiores, non ut tam diu lugerent, sed ne diutius.*

268 LEGUM PRIMA SECURIS Prop. cited on ver. 254. Sen. in Lact. VII 15 § 14 *maluisse* legibus *obtemperare quam* regibus. Sil. XIII 121 *nunc meritum saeva Brutum immortale* securi | *nomen.*

272 UT 'though.' Hor. ep. I 12 8. Sen. ep. 94 § 36 *non statim sequitur...:* ut *sequatur.* Lewis and Short 1943 col. 2 f. 3 pr.

UT LONGE REPETAS cf. XV 30 n. *quamquam omnia syrmata volvas.* Sil. XV 90 *nec* longe repetam. *alte* and *altius* very frequent with *repeto.*

273 INFAMI ASYLO Luc. VII 438 *Romulus* infami *complevit moenia luco.* Mithridates in Iustin XXXVIII 6 § 7 *hanc illos omnibus regibus legem odiorum dixisse, scilicet quia ipsi tales reges habuerint, quorum etiam nominibus erubescant, aut* pastores *Aboriginum, aut haruspices Sabinorum, aut exsules Corinthiorum, aut servos vernasque Tuscorum, aut, quod honoratissimum nomen fuit inter haec, Superbos.* Plut. Romulus 7 § 2 *συνῆγον δὲ καὶ προσεδέχοντο πολλοὺς μὲν ἀπόρους, πολλοὺς δὲ δούλους.* 9 § 5 *ἔπειτα τῆς πόλεως τὴν πρώτην ἵδρυσιν λαμβανούσης, ἱερόν τι φύξιμον τοῖς ἀφισταμένοις κατασκευάσαντες, ὃ θεοῦ ἀσυλαίου προσηγόρευον, ἐδέχοντο πάντας οὔτε δεσπόταις δοῦλον οὔτε θῆτα χρήσταις οὔτ' ἄρχουσιν ἀνδροφόνον ἐκδιδόντες.* 14 § 3 few in that chance gathering could indicate their parents. comp. Thes. c. Rom. 4 § 1 *δοῦλοι γὰρ δὴ καὶ συφορβῶν παῖδες ὀνομαζόμενοι.*

275 PASTOR Varro r.r. II 1 § 9 *Romanum vero populum a* pastoribus *esse ortum quis non dicit? quis Faustulum nescit* pastorem *fuisse nutricium, qui Romulum et Remum educavit? non ipsos quoque fuisse* pastores *obtinebit, quod Parilibus potissimum condidere urbem?* cet.

QUOD DICERE NOLO Catull. 67 45 46 *praeterea addebat quendam, quem* dicere nolo | *nomine, ne tollat rubra supercilia.*

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

VARIOUS CONJECTURES I.

Aesch. *P. V.* 558 *Ζῆνα γὰρ οὐ τρομέων*
ἰδίᾳ γνώμᾳ σέβῃ
θνατοὺς ἄγαν, Προμηθεῦ.

Babrius xlv. 7 :

ταῖς μὲν φέρων ἔβαλλε θαλλὸν ἐξ ὕλης
τὰς δ' ἰδίας ἀφῆκε μακρὰ λιμώττειν.

Dr Rutherford has the following notes: 'Athoam lectionem *τὰς δ' ἰδίας* mutare nolo. Ego certe facilius crediderim Babrium primam syllabam longam fecisse quam criticorum tentamina scripsisse, *τὰς δ' ἰδίας, τὰς δὲ τιθασοὺς, τὰς δ' ἐνδίους, τὰς δέ γ' ἰδίας, τὰς δ' ἐννύχας* (sic). Viro sobrio talia placere nequeunt.' 'I am inclined to think that Babrius really wrote the word with the iota long. It is also long in Aesch. *P. V.* 543, *ἰδίᾳ γνώμῃ σέβει*, which corresponds to *ἀλλά μοι τοῦτ'* (*τόδ'* MSS.) *ἐμμένοι*. Most editors have rightly tried to alter it in that passage but with as little success there as here. The conjectures *αὐτόνῳ, οἰόφρων, αὐτόβουλος ὤν, μουνάδι*, recommend themselves to nobody but the fathers who begat them, and Verrall's special pleading for *ἠλεᾷ* is too baseless and too brilliant to convince sober critics.'

Other conjectures recorded by Wecklein are *ἐν ἰδίᾳ, ἴδριδι, νηπίᾳ, κυρίᾳ, δαίᾳ, ἰθέᾳ, ἀντίᾳ, αὐτογνωμόνως, αὐτοβουλίᾳ*. Those are right who regard *ἰδίᾳ*, at any rate, as an adscript, for *ἴδιος* is regularly used in explanations of words compounded of *αὐτός*: as

Soph. *Ant.* 821 *αὐτόνομος*] *μετ' ἐλευθερίας τεθνήξῃ ἰδίῳ καὶ καινῷ νόμῳ...ἢ ἀντὶ ἰδίοις αὑτῆς νόμοις χρησαμένη*. Sch. L.

Soph. *Ant.* 875 *σὲ δ' αὐτόγνωτος ὤλεσ'* *ὀργά*] *αὐθαίρετος καὶ ἰδιογνώμων τρόπος*. Sch. L, as Etym. Mag.

Aesch. *Theb.* 1044 *ἀλλ' αὐτόβουλος ἴσθ'*] *τουτέστι τῇ ἰδίᾳ γνώμῃ ὃ βούλει πρᾶττε.* Sch. rec.

Meineke's *αὐτόβουλος ὤν*, therefore, is objectionable only because it follows immediately on *τρομέων*, asyndeton being out of place here. Heimsoeth's *αὐτοβουλίᾳ* I believe to be right, though the substantive is not extant elsewhere. Cf.

Aesch. *Pers.* 751 *ὥστ' οὐκ εὐβουλίᾳ.*

Aesch. *Theb.* 735 *κρατηθεὶς δ' ἐκ φίλων ἀβουλίᾳ* (so rightly *recc.*; *ἀβουλίαν* M, final *ι* and final *ν* being very often confused: *φίλων* = *τῆς γυναικός*).

Eur. *fr.* 1077 *ὤλοντ' ἐρῶντες μειζόνων ἀβουλίᾳ.*

I mention this passage because I think I can emend the line in Babrius. The Aesopic versions of this fable (12 and 12 b Halm) have *ταῖς μὲν ἰδίαις μετρίαν τροφὴν...ταῖς δὲ ὀθνείαις* and *τὰς ἰδίας δὲ ἀφεὶς...τὰς μὲν ἰδίας...*, as is natural in prose. But it is not necessary in verse and Babrius does not write false quantities. Read, therefore,

τὰς δ' ἡδέως ἀφῆκε μακρὰ λιμώττειν (*lubenter*).

For the corruption (here made fatally easy by the sense) compare the following:

Charito p. 141. 3 *καὶ τοῦτο ἐκείνοις ἥδιον ἦν*] 'solito errore in *apographo ἴδιον*.' D'Orville.

Manetho v. 273 *ἐν ἰδίεσι μελίσσαις*] *ἡδείαισι* D'Orville.

Xen. *Symp.* viii. 13 *ἀνάγκη ἰδία*] *ἡδεῖα* Valckenaer.

Theophrast. *de ventis* 38 *διὸ καὶ Φιλόξενος ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ πεποίηκε τὴν πνοήν*] *ἡδεῖαν* Meineke.

Plut. *Mor.* 943 d *μετ' ἐλπίδος ἰδίας ἔχουσιν*] *ἡδείας* Cobet.

Athen. iii. 93 b *ποικίλαι ἡδεῖαι*] *ἰδέαι* Coraes.

„ xii. 521 c *ἴδιον*] *ἥδιον* cod. A.

Aesch. *P. V.* 707:

ἀπροσδόκητος δ' αὐτὸν αἰφνίδιος μόρος
τοῦ ζῆν ἀπεστέρησεν.

'Gaisfordius ad Hephaest. p. 242. *ἐξαίφνης* reponendum censebat, quod in Arund. pro interpretatione, item ut in G. superscriptum est. Speciosa est Elmsleii coniectura, scripsisse Aeschylum *ἀφνίδιος*, ab *ἄφνω*, quae forma hodie apud solum

exstet Hesychium, *ἀφνιδία, ἀφνιδίως, ἄφνω*. Tamen ille mihi non persuasit qui videam quidem analogiae convenire eam formam, sed tamen suspectam habeam quum usus diphthongum etiam in prosa oratione, si libris fides est, probasse videatur. Negavitque Porsonus, Dobraeo teste in Aristophanicis p. 145, unquam Atticos dixisse *ἀφνίδιος*. Atque illa quae in codicibus illis adscripta est interpretatio *ἐξαίφνης* pridem me moverat, ut *αἰφνίδιος* vel ex *αἰφνιδίως* vel ex ipso illo cui interpretando inservire *αἰφνιδίως* poterat, *αἰφνίδια* ortum existimarem. Itaque illam Hesychii glossam ad hunc ipsum referri credo Aeschyli versum.' Hermann.

Hesychius gives *ἄπτερος*: *αἰφνίδιος, παρὰ Ὁμήρῳ. ὁ προσηνής. ἢ ταχύς.* Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι [288]. And immediately following, ... *αἰφνίδιον*, where Voss supplies *ἀπτέρως* as the lemma. This adverb (= *ἀπτερέως* Parmenid. 15, Ap. Rhod. iv. 1765) occurs in

Lycophr. *Al.* 627:

ἦ γὰρ ἀπτέρως
αὐταὶ παλιμπόρευτον ἵξονται βάσιν

and may well be right in our passage; but I would prefer

ἀπροσδοκήτως δ' αὐτὸν ἄπτερος μόρος.

Aesch. *Supp.* 174 *καὶ τότ' οὐ δικαίοις*
Ζεὺς ἐνεύξεται λόγοις
τὸν τᾶς βοὸς
παῖδ' ἀτιμάσας, τὸν αὐ-
τός ποτ' ἔκτισεν γόνῳ,
νῦν ἔχων παλίντροπον
ὄψιν ἐν λιταῖσιν·

So M and schol. *ἐνέξεται* Porson, *ἐνάξεται* or *ἐλέγξεται* Marckscheffel, *ἐπεύξεται* Westphal.

Dr Tucker states the difficulty: '*οὐ δικαίοις ἐνέξεται λόγοις*, not to be confounded with the ordinary phrases *ἐνέχεσθαι ἐγκλήματι, αἰτίᾳ, ἐπιτιμίοις*; for in these *ἐνέχεσθαι* is joined with a dative of the *charge* or *penalty* to which one is liable. Here *ἐν οὐ δικαίοις λόγοις* "in an unjust plea" is the condition or position in which Zeus will find himself entangled. Accord-

ing to the former use the absurd result would be "Zeus will be unjustly arraigned." Weil says = *ἄδικος ἀκούσεται*, but analysis does not elicit that meaning. Rather "Zeus will be in the difficulty of having no just plea of defence." The word has not yet become wholly one of legal diction: cf. Hdt. I. 190 *Κῦρος ἀπορίῃσι ἐνείχετο*, and II. 121 *τῇ πάγῃ ἐνέχεσθαι*.'

The word never does become wholly one of legal diction; but these and other examples that might be quoted do not lessen the awkwardness of a construction with *λόγοις*, which should naturally be those spoken of Zeus, not by him. But even if we waive this objection, there is another supposition at least as hard to make, that *λόγοις* here, without help or definition, means *defence* or *apology*, which in this sentence seems scarcely credible. A very probable change of one letter and the punctuation will make the sentence entirely normal and satisfactory:

καὶ τότ' οὐ δικαίοις
Ζεὺς ἐνέξεται ψόγοις...;

The corruption of *ψόγος*, *ψέγειν* into *λόγος*, *λέγειν* is so frequent that it is unnecessary to illustrate it here.

Aesch. *Ag.* 543:

XO. *κῆρυξ Ἀχαιῶν χαῖρε τῶν ἀπὸ στρατοῦ.*
KH. *χαίρω· τεθνᾶναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ θεοῖς.*

544 *οὐκέτ'* in the quotation of this line in schol. M on 555. h has *οὐκέτ'*.

The form *τεθνᾶναι* was long ago rejected by Hermann, whom see. After quoting a scholiast on Ar. *Ran.* 1012 *τί παθεῖν φήσεις ἄξιος εἶναι;* ΔΙ. *τεθνάναι· μὴ τοῦτον ἐρώτα*] *βραχυκαταληκτεῖ δὲ ἐνταῦθα*, and grammarians attesting the form *τεθνᾶναι*, he remarks: 'Apertum est commenta haec esse recentiorum grammaticorum, qui quod *τεθνάναι* et *ἑστάναι* ut vulgus male pronuntiarent, syllabam putabant longam esse.' Rightly; cf.

Mimnermus 2. 10 *αὐτίκα δὴ τεθνάναι βέλτιον ἢ βίοτος.* '*τεθνάμεναι* Bach, codd. *δὴ τεθνάναι*, Stephanus et O. Schneider *τεθνᾶναι*, at eiusmodi forma satis dubiae est auctoritatis, cf. Hermann ad Aeschyli Agam. 517. defendit tamen Ahrens Philol.

Suppl. 1 539. barbaram censet Cobet Var. L. 1 390 (ubi apud Mimn. *αὐτίκα δὴ θάνατος* parum apte legendum censet), cf. etiam Contos 'Ερμῆς λόγιος 1 25.' Bergk.

Theognis 181 *τεθνάμεναι, φίλε Κύρνε, πενιχρῷ βέλτιον ἀνδρί.* '*τεθνάμεναι* A, *τεθνάναι* bcfgm, *τεθνᾶναι* dehln, in O evan.' Bergk.

Veitch refers also to Ael. *V. H.* 3. 2. 3, 12. 3. 57, and to *Christ. Pat.* 698 *ποθῶ τεθνᾶναι, ζῆν δ' ἔτ' οὐδαμῶς στέγω.* Add (since I have nowhere found it remarked that this accentuation is far from uncommon):

Christ. Pat. 473 *ποθῶ τεθνᾶναι* (as 698).
" " 713 *ἠθέλησε τεθνᾶναι* (end of line) CMVD.
" " 1328 *ἠθέλησας τεθνᾶναι* (end of line) M.
Alciphron iii. 54 *μετὰ χρημάτων τεθνᾶναι.*
Stobaeus lxxxv. 19 *τὸν ἄνδρα εὔχεται τεθνᾶναι.*
Eur. *Phoen.* 87 *τὸν αὐτὸν ἀεὶ δυστυχῆ καθεστᾶναι* B.

Other cases might be given, and doubtless there are many in MSS. which it has not seemed worth while to record. I found several lately when collating Thucydides viii in cod. C (saec. X).

The conjectures as recorded by Wecklein are:

χαίρω· θεοῖσι τεθνάναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ . . .	Hermann.
χαίρω γε· τεθνάναι δ' οὐκέτ' ἀντερῶ θεοῖς .	olim Enger.
χαίρω τι·	Dindorf.
χαίρω τε τεθνάναι τ'	Heimsoeth.
χαίρω· θανεῖν γὰρ	Franz.
χαίρετε· θανεῖν δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ θεοῖς ἔτι . .	Naber.
χαίρω <κατελθών>· τεθνάναι δ' οὐκ ἀντερῶ	Weil.
καὶ δῆτα χαίρω	suggested by Wecklein.

Against all these it shall be enough to point out that *ἀντιλέγω θανεῖν* could not possibly mean 'I refuse to die;' still less could *ἀντιλέγω τεθνάναι.* Hartung's

χαίρω· θανεῖν ἂν δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἀντερῶ θεοῖς

would mean 'I will not urge against the gods that I would die;' and Kayser's

χαίρω· θανεῖν δέ μ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἀντερῶ θεοῖς

'I will not urge against the gods that I died.' The only conjecture that approaches the meaning aimed at is Schneidewin's

χαίρω· τὸ τεθνάναι δ' οὐκ ἔτ' ἀντερῶ θεοῖς,

if rendered 'as to dying, I will no more oppose the gods.'

The general idea is doubtless the same as that in

Hom. *η* 225:

ὥς κ' ἐμὲ τὸν δύστηνον ἐμῆς ἐπιβήσετε πάτρης
καίπερ πολλὰ παθόντα· ἰδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν
κτῆσιν ἐμὴν δμῶάς τε καὶ ὑψερεφὲς μέγα δῶμα,

first cited by Butler. Add:

h. Aphrod. 154:

βουλοίμην κεν ἔπειτα, γύναι εἰκυῖα θεῇσιν,
σῆς εὐνῆς ἐπιβάς, δῦναι δόμον Ἄιδος εἴσω.

Aesch. *Cho.* 437 *ἔπειτ' ἐγὼ νοσφίσας ὀλοίμαν.*

Callim. *fr.* 219 *τεθναίην ὅτ' ἐκεῖνον ἀποπνεύσαντα πυθοίμην.*

Guided by these passages, I propose:

χαίρω· τεθναίην δ'· οὐκέτ' ἀνταίρω θεοῖς.
or *χαίρω· τεθναίην δ' οὐκ ἂν ἀνταίρων θεοῖς.*

preferring the first. This is without the clumsiness of Schneidewin's reading, and seems better to suit the positive expression in the reference of the Chorus:

555 ὡς νῦν τὸ σὸν δή, καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.

I am inclined to prefer *ἀνταίρω* to *ἀντερῶ*, the change being, of course, of the easiest. Cf.

Hesych. *ἀντεροῦσιν: ἀντιλέγουσι. Σοφοκλῆς Θυέστῃ* (*fr.* 243). *i.e. ἀνταίρουσι*, as Voss emends, and the order of letters proves.

Aesch. *Cho.* 687:

— ὂἰ εγὼ κατάκρασε͡ὲ πᾶσ' ὡ σπορθόυμεθα·

This is the nearest representation I can give of the appearance of M. Prof. Vitelli (in Wecklein's text) says: *ἐνπᾶσ* (*-σ'* m) M. Rightly. I add a further account from my own examination. Both the marks of apostrophe are by m; the

rest of the points (including a dot over the *ν* of *εν*, which is written in one symbol) are by M, except the accent on *πασ*, which has certainly been touched up, and, I believe, altered from *πάσ* to *πᾶσ*. M therefore seems to have written:

ὃῖ εγὼ κατάκρασ̈ὲν πάσ ὡσπορθόυμεθα·

The conjectures recorded by Wecklein are *ἐνθάδ' ὡς, ἐκπαθῶς, ἔμπας ὡς, ἔμπαν ὡς, ἐμφανῶς, ἐμπέδως, ἔμπα πως, νηλεῶς, ἐκ βάθρων, νεοπαθῶς, νεοπαθεῖς, ἐλπίδος*. Bamberger and Paley conjectured *εἶπας*, which Wecklein, further reading *οἷς* with H. L. Ahrens, adopts in his edition of 1888. To this, however, there is a fatal objection. In all the abundant instances of this idiomatic *εἶπας* or *λέγεις* the construction is always with a simple accusative. We could have

πόρθησιν εἶπας δωμάτων πανώλεθρον

as Aesch. *Pers.* 303 *ἐμοῖς μὲν εἶπας δώμασιν φάος μέγα*, or (though this would scarcely be suitable here)

οἳ 'γώ, κατάκρας εἶπας ἐκπορθουμένους

as Ar. *Plut.* 992 *λέγεις ἐρῶντ' ἄνθρωπον ἐκνομιώτατα.*

But there is no parallel for such a construction as *κατάκρας εἶπας ὡς πορθούμεθα* or *κ. εἶπας οἷς π.*, though this last is better.

I thought once of an adverb *ἐμπαίως* (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 197 *ἐμπαίοις τύχαισι*), as *προσπαίως* from *πρόσπαιος*, *ἔμπαῖον* (in the sense *ἔμπειρον, ἐντριβῆ*) occurring in Hom. *υ* 379. But since the phrase *ἐν πᾶσι* is used not seldom in late Greek, I have for some time believed that we have here merely an adscript. Scholia nearly always have *κατὰ πάντα*, but after long search I find the following:

Hesych. *πανέξαλλον: ἐν πᾶσιν ἀλλότριον.*

Eur. *Hec.* 429 (427 K) *ὧδε πάντα δυστυχῶ*] *ἐν πᾶσι* schol. Fl. 21.

Cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 492 (493 K) *πάντα πράσσων σὺν δίκῃ*] *ἤγουν ἐν οὐδενὶ ἀδικῶν.*

Schol. V. Ar. *Pax* 505 *φησὶν οὖν ἐν οὐδενὶ ἱκανοί ἐστε πλὴν ἐν τῷ δικάζειν. καλῶς δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀπέσκωψεν ἵνα*

μὴ τὸ πᾶν διαβάλῃ ποίημα ὡς ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεσθαι προαιρούμενος . . .

I think, therefore, that ἐν πᾶσι is an explanation either of πάντα or of some adverb compounded of πᾶς as πανταχῶς, πανδίκως; or perhaps our text is the result of ΕΝ ΠΑCΙ ΩC ΠΑΝΤΑΧΗ, *i.e.* ἐν πᾶσι + a variant πανταχῶς adscribed to πανταχῆ. Cf. Eur. *Andr.* 883 πανταχῆ δ' ὀλώλαμεν.

ἔμπαιος, however, may be the true reading in

Aesch. *Pers.* 601 ὅστις ἔμπορος κυρεῖ

cf. Hom. φ 400 κακῶν ἔμπαιος ἀλήτης. Lycophr. *Al.* 1321 ἔμπαιον δρόμων. Wecklein suggests ἐμπερής. *recc.* have ἔμπειρος, but schol. rec. has συνήθης, μέτοχος, which could not have been written to ἔμπειρος, itself the habitual explanation of its synonyms; and these words seem to me too vague and general to have been written to ἔμπορος. Cf.

Hesych. ἔμπαιον: ἔμπειρον, μέτοχον.

Suid. ἔμπαιος: ἔμπειρος.

Eustath. 1896. 41 ἔμπαιος δὲ ὁ ἔμπειρος καὶ ἐντριβὴς . . .

Hesych. ἐμπερής: ἔμπειρος. Σοφοκλῆς Ὀδυσσεῖ μαινομένῳ.

Schol. rec. should certainly be . . . . .] ἔμπειρος, συνήθης, μέτοχος.

Aesch. *Cho.* 688:

> ὦ δυσπάλαιστε τῶνδε δωμάτων ἀρά,
> ὡς πόλλ' ἐπωπᾷς κἀκποδὼν εὖ κείμενα
> τόξοις πρόσωθεν εὐσκόποις χειρουμένη
> φίλων τ' ἀποψιλοῖς με τὴν παναθλίαν.
> καὶ νῦν Ὀρέστης, ἦν γὰρ εὐβούλως ἔχων
> ἔξω κομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα, . . .

691. τ' addidit Hartung. 692. εὐβόλως Porson.

Though Porson's εὐβόλως is generally accepted, Wecklein in his text of 1885 merely records it in his Appendix, not considering it worthy even of the margin. In his annotated edition of 1888 he retains εὐβούλως without mentioning Porson's conjecture, comparing

Eur. *Heracl.* 109:

> *καλὸν δέ γ' ἔξω πραγμάτων ἔχειν πόδα*
> *εὐβουλίας τυχόντα τῆς ἀμείνονος,*

i.e. 'discretion is the better part of valour.' But certainly it was not *εὐβουλία* on the part of Orestes that sent him away; Clytemnestra herself, apologising to Agamemnon for the absence of Orestes, states, as the reason, that her own prudence had induced her to give him into the charge of Strophius (*Ag.* 868—877). I cannot but share the general feeling that *εὐβόλως* gives a more appropriate sense, and shall therefore endeavour to commend it. For the adverb the *Thesaurus* merely quotes Porson's reading of our passage, with Blomfield's note: 'Εὐβόλως ἔχων. *Prospero jactu usus.* Pollux IX. 94. *ἐν μέντοι γε τοῖς κύβοις τὸ δυσκυβεῖν, καὶ εὐκυβεῖν, ὀνομάζεται· καί που καὶ τὸ δύσβολον, καὶ τὸ εὔβολον εἶναι.* Aristaen. I. 23. *ἐμὲ γὰρ κατανάλωσαν ἄπληστος ἑταίρα, καὶ πεσσοὶ πίπτοντες ἀτυχῶς μὲν ἐμοί, εὐβολώτερον δὲ τοῖς ἐναντίοις.* Ita Salmasius pro *εὐβουλότερον*, probante Hemsterhusio ad Pollucis locum, unde confirmatur in hoc versu Porsoni correctio. Ejusdem confusionis exempla dedit Boissonadus ad Aristaen. p. 539.' For the adjective the places cited in the *Thesaurus* are:

Heliodor. *Aeth.* v. 18 *ἦν εὔβολόν τι χρῆμα καὶ πολύθηρον (ἡ ἄγρα).*

Oppian. *Hal.* iii. 71 *εὔβολος ἔσσεται ἄγρη.*

Suid. Μίδας: . . . *καὶ μίδας, κύβου ὄνομα εὐβολωτάτου. καὶ παροιμία.* Μίδας *ὁ ἐν κύβοις εὐβολώτατος. ὁ γὰρ* Μίδας *βόλου ἐστὶν ὄνομα.*

On this last passage Bernhardy's note is: '*εὐβολωτάτου*] Sic recte habent MSS. Pariss. At in prioribus editt. [et E.] male legitur *εὐβουλοτάτου*. Idem etiam dictum velim de voce sequenti *εὐβολώτατος*: cuius loco priores editt. [et E.] itidem male exhibent *εὐβουλότατος*. *Küst.* Correxit etiam Meursius. *εὐβουλωτάτου* B. et mox *εὐβουλώτατος*. Conf. App. Vat. II., 69. Dorvill. Crit. Vann. p. 276. et Hemsterhus. in Polluc. IX., 94.'

This error, *βουλ-* for *βολ-*, is extremely common. Besides

Boissonade on Aristaen. i. 23, see D'Orville on Charito pp. 34, 509; and add:

Hesych. *συμβο[υ]λεύς*: *ἁλιευτικὸν σκεῦος* . . .

A passage in schol. Pind. *O.* vii. 33 (19 Bergk) is, I think, considerable support for the metaphorical use of *εὔβολος*:

. . . *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ φαμὲν εὔβολον διακεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὅταν ᾖ καλῶς διακείμενον. ὥστε τὴν μεταφορὰν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁλιέων εἶναι* . . .

Perhaps *εὐβόλως* should there be read. There seems therefore to be no objection to a phrase *εὐβόλως* (= *εὐτυχῶς*) *ἔχων*, and the likelihood that it would be corrupted into *εὐβούλως ἔχων* is very great. Cf. *εὐπετῶς ἔχειν* in *Ag.* 557.

There is another place where I suspect this phrase should be restored:

Menander (Stob. *fl.* lxiv. 15) *fr.* 48:

τὸ δ' ἐρᾶν ἐπισκοτεῖ
ἅπασιν, ὡς ἔοικε, καὶ τοῖς εὐλόγως
καὶ τοῖς καλῶς ἔχουσιν.

κακῶς for *καλῶς* Clericus. *καὶ τοῖς εὖ λόγων*, or *καὶ τοῖς εὐλόγοις καὶ τοῖς κακῶς φρονοῦσιν* Meineke. I would read

καὶ τοῖς εὐβόλως
καὶ τοῖς κακῶς ἔχουσιν.

εὐλόγως has been doubted in Eur. (Stob. *fl.* cviii. 13) *fr.* 175:

ὅστις δὲ πρὸς τὸ πῖπτον εὐλόγως φέρει
τὸν δαίμον' οὗτος ἥσσόν ἐστιν ὄλβιος.

εὐκόλως Meineke, which was not likely to be displaced, since *εὔκολος, -ως, δύσκολος, -ως* are the words regularly used in scholia for 'easy,' 'hard.' *εὐλόφως* Abresch, which Nauck accepts. But the metaphor ill suits *πρὸς τὸ πῖπτον*, and a comparison of other quotations under the same title, *ὅτι δεῖ γενναίως φέρειν τὰ προσπίπτοντα κ.τ.λ.*, will show, I think, that *εὐλόγως, reasonably,* is sound:

30 *Μενάνδρου Κανηφόρῳ*:

ἀλογίστου τρόπου
ἀτύχημα φεύγειν ἐστὶν οὐκ αὐθαίρετον.

33 Φιλήμονος:

. . . . . .

ὁ δὲ τῷ λογισμῷ πάντα παρ' ἑαυτῷ σκοπῶν . .

64 Δημοκρίτου:

ἀλογιστίη μὴ συγχωρέειν ταῖσι κατὰ τὸν βίον ἀνάγκαις.

65 Ἀρριανοῦ Ἐπικτητίου:

. . ὁ δὲ ταῦτα γενναίως φέρων καὶ εὐλογίστως τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῶν . .

Cf. also 28 and 66.

For ὄλβιος Nauck reads Herwerden's ἄθλιος, not mentioning the conjecture recorded by Gaisford 'ἧσσόν ἐστ' ἀνόλβιος Grotius, e Scaligeri emendatione.'

I will not support my reading in Menander *fr.* 48 by the variation in

Aesch. *Pers.* 906 οὐκ ἀμφιλόγως M οὐκ ἀμφιβόλως *recc.* for this is due to the fact that ἀμφίβολος, -ως are the scholiastic words for 'doubtful'; just as to Aesch. *Theb.* 794 οὐκ ἀμφιλέκτως there is an adscript ἀμφιβόλως. It is not, however, necessary on that account to alter οὐκ ἀμφιβόλως in Aesch. *Theb.* 849.

Aesch. *Cho.* 785:

Ἔ ἔ. πρὸ δὲ δὴ 'χθρῶν
τὸν ἔσωθεν μελάθρων, Ζεῦ, θές,

δήιος is almost always explained by πολέμιος, but schol. Eur. *Andr.* 826 (809 K) δάια] διακοπτικά, πολέμια, ἐχθρά, confirms my suspicion that our text was caused by ἐχθρῶν adscribed over δῄων, ΕΧΘΡΩΝ / ΔΗΙΩΝ.

Soph. *fr.* 620 (Stob. *fl.* cv. 39):

τὸ δ' εὐτυχοῦντα πάντ' ἀριθμῆσαι βροτῶν
οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος ὄντιν' εὑρήσεις ἕνα.

τὸ δ' εὐτυχεῖν A. τὸν δ' Grotius, τὸν εὐτ. Pappageorgius, τοὺς εὐτυχοῦντας Wecklein. ἀριθμήσας Grotius, πάντας ἀθρήσας F. G. Schmidt. ὄντως Gesner, οἶκος (vel ὀρθῶς et antea βροτόν) F. G. Schmidt.

The second line, I suspect, should be *οὐκ ἔστιν οὗ* (or *ᾗ* or *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπου*) *τοίόν τιν'* (or *τοιοῦτον*) *εὑρήσεις ἕνα.*

Soph. *fr.* 666 (Stob. *fl.* cxiv. 6):

> *τοὺς δ' αὖ μεγίστους καὶ σοφωτάτους φρενὶ*
> *τοιούσδ' ἴδοις ἂν οἷός ἐστι νῦν ὅδε,*
> *καλῶς κακῶς πράσσοντι συμπαραινέσαι,*
> *ὅταν δὲ δαίμων ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχοῦς τὸ πρὶν*
> *μάστιγ' ἐρείσῃ τοῦ βίου παλίντροπον,*
> *τὰ πολλὰ φροῦδα καὶ καλῶς εἰρημένα.*

'*καλῶς* vitiosum' Nauck. *πλάστιγγ'* for *μάστιγ'* Ellendt.

The general sense of the passage is plain, even were the title of Stobaeus absent, *ὅτι ῥᾷον ἄλλον παραινεῖν ἢ ἑαυτόν*, and the other quotations under that title. Compare, besides these, the following:

Aesch. *P. V.* 279:

> *ἐλαφρὸν ὅστις πημάτων ἔξω πόδα*
> *ἔχει παραινεῖν νουθετεῖν τε τὸν κακῶς*
> *πράσσοντ'·*

Fr. adesp. in Bekker. Anecd. p. 38. 7:

> *ἐλαφρὸν παραινεῖν <τῷ> κακῶς πεπραγότι.*

Aesch. *P. V.* 351:

> *πολλῷ γ' ἀμείνων τοὺς πέλας φρενοῦν ἔφυς*
> *ἢ σαυτόν·*

It would be obvious to write *καλούς*, but though *κακός*, *ἀγαθός*, *σοφός*, etc., are often used with an infinitive, *καλὸς* is never so used. I suspect that *δεινοὺς* has been supplanted, a word most appropriate in this place. Cf. *e.g.*:

Mimnermus Trag. (Stob. *fl.* cxxv. 12) *fr.* i:

> *δεινοὶ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ πάντες ἐσμὲν εὐκλεεῖ*
> *ζῶντι φθονῆσαι κατθανόντα δ' αἰνέσαι.*

δεινὸς in this sense is regularly explained by *ἱκανός*, and I suggest that our text was caused by an adscript *ἱκανούς*. It may also be suggested that there was on this passage a marginal note *καλῶς*, which was wrongly included in the text: see Cobet *Novae Lectt.* p. 441: '... Adscripsit aliquis in ora libri

admirabundus *καλῶς*, quod saepe fieri solere norunt quibus Codices complures versare contigit.'

There are several places where it is likely that *ἱκανὸς* has ousted *δεινός*, *e.g.*:

Eur. (Stob. *fl.* iv. 2) *fr.* **1031**:

> *τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι σε μηδὲν ὧν ἁμαρτάνεις*
> *ἔκκαυμα τόλμης ἱκανόν ἐστι καὶ θράσους.*

Soph. (Stob. *fl.* vol. iv. p. 242 ed. Mein.) *fr.* 869:

> *ταλῃθὲς ἀεὶ πλεῖστον ἰσχύει λόγου*

ἰσχύειν λέγω Nauck, *ἰσχύει λόγῳ* Conington, *ἰσχύειν φιλεῖ* F. G. Schmidt.

Perhaps *ἰσχύειν λόγος*. The phrase *ταλῃθὲς γὰρ ἰσχὺον τρέφω* in Soph. *O. T.* 356 suggests that this was a proverbial saying.

Confusion between *ἑταίρα* and *ἑτέρα* is extremely frequent; but *ἑταίρα* is an error in at least two places where *ἑτέρα* cannot be substituted:

Sophocles (Ath. xiii. 604 f) *fr.* 4 Bergk:

> *Ἥλιος ἦν, οὐ παῖς, Εὐριπίδη, ὅς με χλιαίνων*
> *γυμνὸν ἐποίησεν· σοὶ δὲ φιλοῦντι ἑταίραν*
> *Βορρᾶς ὠμίλησε.*

'P *φιλοῦντι ἑτέραν*, B *φιλοῦντι ἑταῖραν*. Haec verba mendosa esse iure censuit Meineke.' Bergk.

'*φιλοῦνθ' ἑτέραν* Mus, quod ne Hieronymum quidem puto scripturum fuisse.' Kaibel.

Macho (Ath. xiii. 579 b) *v.* 27:

> *μετὰ ταῦτα δ' ὡς εἰσῆλθε πάλιν ἡ Μανία,*
> *τὸν αὐτόμολον ἔσκωπτε ῥίψασπίν τ' ἔφη*
> *αὐτὸν γεγονέναι προσβολῆς οὔσης ποτέ.*
> *ὁ δὲ στρατιώτης ὑπό τι <δὴ> σκυθρωπάσας*
> *ἀπέπεμψε ταύτην· διαλιποῦσα δ' ἡ ἑταίρα*
> *μηθὲν παρὰ τοῦτο, φησί, λυποῦ, φίλτατε.*

'*ἀπεπέμψατ' αὐτήν· διαλιποῦσα δ' ἡμέραν* K, *ἐπεπέμψατ' αὐτήν· διαλιποῦσα δ' ἠρέμα* Mein.' Kaibel.

Here I suspect either *ἡ γυνὴ* or *ἡ κόρη* (and perhaps *ἀπέπεμπε*); but since the accusative *γυνὴν* is recorded only from Comedy, nothing but *κόρην* seems likely in the epigram of Sophocles. Though *κόρη* is generally used of a young maiden, the second condition is not always necessary: schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1162 (1169 K) *τὸ δὲ κόρη διαφόρως τάττουσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ γυνή.* *Anth. Pal.* v. 243. The lemma to *A. P.* v. 5:

... τῆς ἐπιόρκου
παντοπαθῆ κούρης αἴσχεα δερκόμενος

is *εἰς ἑταίραν τινά*: to *A. P.* v. 220:

... τὴν ῥαδινὴν κούρην

the lemma is *ἐπί τινι Κλεοβούλῳ τὴν παλλάκην ἐπικείραντι.* In Menander (Eustath. 1166. 52) *fr.* 727:

λελουμένη γὰρ ἡ ἑταίρα καὶ διαφανὲς
χιτωνάριον ἔχουσα

either *ἠτέρα* (Bentley) or *παρῆν ἑτέρα* (Nauck) may be right; unless *ἡ ἑταίρα* is merely a supplement by Eustathius.

Eur. *Andr.* 275:

Ἰδαίαν ἐς νάπαν
ἦλθ' ὁ Μαίας τε καὶ Διὸς τόκος
τρίπωλον ἅρμα δαιμόνων
ἄγων τὸ καλλιζυγές,
279 *ἔριδι στυγερᾷ κεκορυθμένον εὐμορφίας*
σταθμοὺς ἔπι βούτα.

279 = 288 *παραβαλλόμεναι.* *Κύπρις εἶλε λόγοις δολίοις.*

That *εὐμορφίας* is an adscript I have no doubt, the substantive, as the adjective, being often so used; *e.g.*

Hesych. *εὐπρέπεια: εὐμορφία.*

Schol. Eur. *Or.* 1388 (1379 K) *καλλοσύνας*] *ὡραιοτάτου, εὐμόρφου, τῆς εὐμορφίας.*

Schol. Pind. *O.* viii. 24 (19 Bergk) *οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων*] *τὴν εὐμορφίαν τοῦ εἴδους οὐ κατελέγχων.*

Heimsoeth proposed *εὐφυίας*, a word not known in verse. I prefer *ἀγλαΐας*, which is often used merely in the sense 'beauty,' and, though I have not found it elsewhere explained

by εὐμορφία, is often explained by κάλλος. Cf. especially Agathias (*A. P.* v. 222):

εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀγλαΐης κρίσις ἵστατο, μᾶλλον ἂν αὐτὴ
Κύπρις ἐνικήθη κἀνεδίκαζε Πάρις.

Eur. *fr.* 793 (Stob. *fl.* lix. 18):

μακάριος ὅστις εὐτυχῶν οἴκοι μένει·
ἐν γῇ δ' ὁ φόρτος, καὶ πάλιν ναυτίλλεται.

Mr Housman (*Cambridge University Reporter*, Nov. 4, 1890) says:

'For πάλιν write ποδοῖν which is easily confused with πόλιν and πόλιν with πάλιν.' But I do not doubt that πόλιν is the right reading. For the form of expression cf.

Eur. *fr.* 670:

ὑγρὰ δὲ μήτηρ, οὐ πεδοστιβὴς τροφὸς
θάλασσα· τήνδ' ἀροῦμεν,...

Aesch. *Theb.* 460:

κόμπον ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων (as Plaut. *Truc.* 483).

Eur. *Supp.* 907:

φρόνημα δὲ
ἐν τοῖσιν ἔργοις οὐχὶ τοῖς λόγοις ἔχων·

so here ναυτίλλεται μὴ θάλασσαν (Hdt. i. 202) ἀλλὰ πόλιν.

The only conjecture recorded by Nauck is 'κοὐ πάλιν, Gesnero duce, Wecklein,' but Gaisford (Stobaeus l. c.) mentions besides this 'καὶ πόλιν Scottus apud Grotium in MS.'

Anacreon (Dio Chrys. *Or.* II T. I 35) *fr.* 2:

σὺ δ' εὐμενὴς
ἔλθ' ἡμῖν, κεχαρισμένης δ'
εὐχωλῆς ἐπακούειν.

'ἔλθ' ἡμῖν, ἔλθοις μοι PCM (sed hi in marg. vulg.).' Bergk.

This variation I suspect to have arisen from an original reading ἐλθέμεν (or ἐλθεῖν μοι), as in

Carm. pop. (Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 36, 7) 6 Bergk:

ἐλθεῖν, ἥρω Διόνυσε,...

This infinitive[1] is apt to be explained and corrupted, as:

Pind. *P.* xi. 65 (42 Bergk):

ἀλλότ' ἄλλα χρὴ ταρασσέμεν

χρὴ (ejected by Schmid) was inserted to explain the infinitive, to which schol. G has *ἀντὶ τοῦ τάρασσε καὶ μετάφερε. λείπει τὸ ὀφείλεις.*

Theognis 309:

ἐν μὲν συσσίτοισιν ἀνὴρ πεπνυμένος εἶναι.

'*εἶναι* A. rel. *ἴσθι.*' Bergk.

Theognis 323:

μή ποτ' ἐπὶ σμικρᾷ προφάσει φίλον ἄνδρ' ἀπολέσσαι.

'*ἀπολέσσαι* A, *ἀπολέσῃς* c, *ἀπολέσσῃς* rel.' Bergk.

[2]Pseudophocylidea 149:

φάρμακα μὴ τεύχειν· μαγικῶν βίβλων ἀπέχεσθαι.

'T *τέυχε*, A 1 *τεύχου.*' Bergk.

Eur. *Or.* 385:

ἤκουσα· φείδου δ' ὀλιγάκις λέγειν κακά.

Schol. *θέλε λέγειν, ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγε* (taking *φείδου δ'* separately). This note explains, I think, the reading in

Meleager (*A. P.* v. 182):

. . . πάντα λέγε·
μὴ φείδου τὰ πάντα λέγε· καίτοι τί σε, Δορκάς,

μὴ φείδου· was taken separately, and *τὰ ἅπαντα λέγειν* (as Hecker rightly reads) explained by *λέγε*. So in

A. P. ix. 498:

μὴ θάπτε τὸν ἄθαπτον· ἔα κυσὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι·

where *Anth. Plan.* has *μὴ θάψῃς*, Jacobs is right in suspecting *μὴ θάπτειν*. Cf. *A. P.* vii. 632 *μήποτε βριθεῖν*, ix. 330 *μὴ ποτὶ νίπτρα φέρειν.* The same thing is well seen in

Simonid. 92 B.:

ὦ ξεῖν' ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις

[1] See commentt. on Greg. Cor. pp. 423 sqq.

[2] The many cases of variation in the Pseudophocylidea I hope to treat another time.

'ὦ ξεῖν' ἀγγέλλειν Herod. codd. Suid. (ABV ἄγγελε), ὦ ξένε ἄγγειλον Diod., ὦ ξεῖν' ἄγγειλον Lyc. Anth. Ars. (om. ὦ), Herod. vett. edd., ὦ ξέν' ἀπάγγειλον Strabo, ap. Iriarte 91, ubi *Alcaeo* tribuitur, ἄγγειλον, sed 293 (ubi s. p. nom.) ἀγγέλλειν.' Bergk.

It is likely, therefore, that in the corrupted passage

Meleag. (*A. P.* xii. 53):

> Εὔφορτοι νᾶες πελαγίτιδες, αἳ πόρον Ἕλλης
> πλεῖτε...
> ἦν που ἐπ' ἠιόνων Κῷαν κατὰ νᾶσον ἴδητε
> Φανίον...
> τοῦτ' ἔπος ἀγγείλατε καλὴ νόες ὥς με

we should read ἀγγεῖλαι or ἀγγέλλειν. Cf. also

Nossis (*A. P.* vii. 718):

> ὦ ξεῖν', εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν,..
> εἰπεῖν, ὡς..

Timocles (Stob. *fl.* lxxix. 17) *fr.* 34:

> ὅστις φοβεῖται τὸν πατέρα κἀσχύνεται,
> οὕτως πολίτης ἀγαθὸς ἔσται κατὰ λόγον,
> καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους δυνάμενος κακῶς ποιεῖν.

For οὕτως read οὗτος, as *e.g. fr.* 35:

> ὅστις δὲ μὴ ἔχει τοῦτο μηδ' ἐκτήσατο,
> οὗτος μετὰ ζώντων τεθνηκὼς περιπατεῖ.

Anth. Pal. vii. 260:

> τέκνων τέκνα λέλοιπα· μιῆς ἀπέλαυσα γυναικὸς
> συγγήρου· τρισσοῖς παισὶν ἔδωκα γάμους.

δοῦναι γάμους to one's son is not a Greek expression. For εδωκα therefore read εδαισα.

A. P. ix. 162:

> Ἥμην ἀχρεῖον κάλαμος φυτόν· ἐκ γὰρ ἐμεῖο
> οὐ σῦκ', οὐ μῆλον φύεται, οὐ σταφυλή.
> ἀλλά μ' ἀνὴρ ἐμύησ' ἑλικωνίδα, λεπτὰ τορήσας
> χείλεα, . .

Cf. Hor. *Sat.* i. 8 Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum. The construction of *v.* 3 is defensible by the analogy of

διδάσκειν, but the reed was not made a Muse or a nymph of Helicon. It is better, I think, to read ἑλικώνια.

A. P. ix. 492. Read

κεῖτο δ' ὁμοῦ σάκος ἔγχος <ὄχος> θώρηξ κόρυς ἵππος.

Boissonade accepts Brunck's supplement ἄκων: but ἵππος argues a chariot, and the omission is intelligible at sight.

A. P. xi. 25:

ἔσσεθ' ὅτ' οὐ πιόμεσθα πολὺς πολύς·

This is generally accepted as an ellipse; but I am inclined to think that πολὺς χρόνος, the reading of the *Anth. Plan.*, is right, supposing a mistake due to doubt between πολὺς χρόνος and χρόνος πολύς. Cf. Eur. *fr.* 398 εὕδουσα δ' Ἰνοῦς συμφορὰ χρόνον πολύν so quoted by Plut. *Anton.* c. 36, but by schol. Pind. *I.* iv. 39 . . . πολὺν χρόνον.

Schol. Aesch. *P. V.* 71 ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ πλευραῖς μασχαλιστῆρας βάλε] ἀντὶ τοῦ δέσμευε αὐτὸν καὶ παρὰ τὰ πλευρά. Read περὶ τὰ π.

Schol. Aesch. *P. V.* 85. We have a choice between two regular forms of expression: Προμηθεὺς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ προορῶν τὰ μήδεα, <Προμηδεύς,> καὶ τροπῇ τοῦ δ εἰς τὸ θ <Προμηθεύς>, or Προμηθεὺς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ προορῶν τὰ μήδεα, κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ δ εἰς τὸ θ.

Schol. Aesch. *Theb.* 1065 μετὰ γὰρ μάκαρας καὶ Διὸς ἰσχὺν ὅδε Καδμείων ἤρυξε πόλιν] ἴσως μάκαρας θεῶν. This, so given by Wecklein, not recorded by Dindorf, is a conflation of two notes on a text

μετὰ γὰρ μακάρων καὶ Διὸς ἰσχύν,

θεῶν being an adscript to μακάρων (as to μάκαρας schol. rec. has τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς ἀθανάτους) and ἴσως μάκαρας a suggestion of the reading now in the text of all MSS. In Cantabr. 2 the adscript θεῶν has taken the place of Διός.

Schol. Aesch. *Cho.* 424 παραιο απριξ πλησσ᾽ τα απριξ. So Wecklein prints, adding 'fort. παρὰ τὸ ἀπρίξ καὶ πλήσσειν, τὰ ἀπρὶξ πλησσόμενα.' But πλησσ᾽τα is simply πλήσσοντα.

Perhaps παρὰ τὸ ἀπρίξ <καὶ πλήσσειν, τὰ> πλήσσοντα ἀπρίξ.

WALTER HEADLAM.

EMENDATIONS OF TIBULLUS AND MARTIAL.

Tibullus II 1 55—58.

Agricola et minio suffusus, Bacche, rubente
primus inexperta duxit ab arte choros.
huic datus a pleno, memorabile munus, ouili
dux pecoris hircus auxerat hircus oues.

This is what the consensus of the best MSS., the Ambrosianus and the Vaticanus, gives us for v. 58 in what Baehrens calls, not unreasonably, a *locus desperatus*. The Guelferbytanus and its interpolator add nothing but two fresh corruptions, *hauserat* and *duxerat*, the latter to lead Heinsius most unfortunately astray. To take the passage in detail. What at first sight more natural than that *oues* should be found in an *ouile*? Yet it is this very *ouile* which has tempted the ingenious scribe to bring them here. After all they have no business with a he-goat; and *ouile* is a fold for goats as in Ov. *Met.* XIII 826 sq. 'sunt, fetura minor, tepidis in ouilibus agni; | sunt quoque, par aetas, aliis in *ouilibus haedi*.' The noun which has been lost in the sheep, and its adjective which the he-goat has swallowed, are both restored by Waardenburgh's brilliant divination, *curtas—opes*. The precise adjective may indeed be a matter for question; but not its meaning, in the presence of *auxerat*: and *curtas* has the advantage of being nearer to *hircus* than *parcas* and other substitutes which might be thought of. But how are the 'narrow means' consistent with the 'full goat-fold' of 57? The aid of punctuation must be invoked. The *dux pecoris* is not a noteworthy offering from a full goat-fold, but an offering which *would* be noteworthy if it came from a full goat-fold. The pregnant use of the adjective requires no illustrating to Latin scholars. Leaving commas after *datus* and

ouili and observing that *huic* is not the god but the countryman, we return to 58. In the first *hircus* it is natural to see a gloss; but this it cannot have been if a *hircus* followed in the same line. Again, Ovid did not think it needful to inform his readers by an apposition what the *dux gregis* was in *Am.* III 13 17 '*dux*que *gregis* cornu per tempora dura recuruo; | inuisa est dominae sola capella deae' (necessary though the information is for the editors that print no stop at *recuruo*), nor thus to explain to them the metaphorical reference in *A. A.* I 522 'nec laedat naris uirque paterque gregis' (although Virgil, translating Theocritus, might write with equal propriety 'uir gregis ipse caper deerrauerat' *Ecl.* VII 7, and, with a maple cow in the neighbourhood, Ovid's phrase would be a natural expression for a bull *A. A.* I 325); and here the mention of Bacchus at once identifies his victim *G.* II 393—395 'ergo rite suum Baccho dicemus honorem | carminibus patriis lancesque et liba feremus | et ductus cornu stabit sacer hircus ad aram.' Accept this reasoning; and the second *hircus* falls. Taking a hint from Heinsius' '*hirtas—oues*' we see that he is *hirtus* but slightly disguised; few confusions are more common than that of *c* and *t*. For *hirtus* of goats see Virg. *G.* III 287, Ovid *F.* II 439 'caper hirtus.'

I would then print the couplet thus:

> huic datus, a pleno memorabile munus ouili,
> dux pecoris curtas auxerat hirtus opes.

MARTIAL IV 74 1—3.

> Aspicis inbelles temptent quam fortia dammae
> proelia? tam timidis quanta sit ira feris?
> in mortem paruis concurrere frontibus ardent.

For the corrupt *paruis* 'uaris' Heinsius, 'pauidis' Koestlin, 'paribus' Munro have been conjectured, but the word wanted is *toruis*. This word is similarly corrupted in Ovid *Met.* II 855 'cornua torua,' so corrected by Mr Housman (*Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* vol. III Part III pp. 142, 143) and in Lucr. VI 131, while in Stat. *Silu.* II 6 40 the MSS. have the converse corruption. *toruus* is a standing epithet of

bulls (compare the passages quoted by Housman l.c.); and in the parallel epigram IV 35 we are told 'frontibus aduersis molles concurrere dammas | uidimus et fati sorte iacere pari.....sic pugnant *tauri*.' In a metaphorical sense 'torua fronte' occurs in IV 14 11.

V 38 1—6.

Calliodorus habet censum (quis nescit?) equestrem,
Sexte, sed et fratrem Calliodorus habet.
"quadringenta seca" qui dicit *σῦκα μερίζει*:
uno credis equo posse sedere duos?
quid cum fratre tibi? quid cum Polluce molesto?
non esset Pollux si tibi, Castor eras.

So Paley and Friedlaender read in v. 3, the MSS. having *secat* and *merice* or *mirice*. Schneidewin, followed by Gilbert, reads 'quadringenta *secat*, qui dicit *σῦκα μέριζε*,' a *praepostera lectio* which should at least have been printed 'quadringenta secat qui, dicit *σῦκα μέριζε*.' It does retain however an element of truth in the second person *μέριζε*. I propose

"quadringenta seca" qui dicis, *σῦκα μέριζε*.

'You say "cut in two an equestrian fortune": then do you yourself perform the feat of dividing a fig. How can you think that two men can sit on one horse?'

J. P. POSTGATE.

LUCRETIANA.

1. Lucr. v. 564, 565

nec nimio solis maior rota nec minor ardor
esse potest nostris quam sensibus esse videtur.

"Again the disk of the sun cannot be much larger nor its body of heat much smaller than they appear to be to our senses." Munro.

According to the text, Lucretius here makes two statements about the sun: 1. that it is not much larger than it appears to be to our sight; 2. that its heat is not much less than it appears to be to our perception. It is clear that the first statement refers to that dogma of Epicurus which has been the mark for so much criticism in ancient and modern times: viz. that the sun is actually of his apparent size or a little larger or a little smaller. It followed naturally from the paramount authority assigned to αἴσθησις; it is stated by Epicurus himself, and quoted twice by Cicero and once by L. Seneca.

But what are we to understand by the second statement, about the sun's heat? If this has any meaning, it must be that the heat is not increased in its passage from the sun to the earth. There is nothing to show that anyone had ever maintained this strange position; nor is there in the letter of Epicurus *de meteoris* any remark on such an increase or diminution of the sun's heat.

Further, we see, in the rest of this paragraph (566—591), that Lucretius deals successively with the moon and stars, and with their size only, asserting of the moon that she is exactly

of the size she appears to us to be of, and of the stars that they may be smaller by a very little or larger by a trifling fraction than they appear. We should therefore expect Lucretius to say of the sun also that it is not much larger nor much smaller than its apparent size.

Now let us look at the other statements we have of the Epicurean view of this question. Epicurus himself says in his letter to Pythocles (Usener, p. 39) *τὸ δὲ μέγεθος ἡλίου τε καὶ σελήνης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἄστρων κατὰ μὲν τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς τηλικοῦτόν ἐστιν ἡλίκον φαίνεται κατὰ δὲ τὸ καθ' αὑτὸ ἤτοι μεῖζον τοῦ ὁρωμένου ἢ μικρῷ ἔλαττον ἢ τηλικοῦτον τυγχάνει.* Again Plutarch (quoted by Usener, p. 230) says of Epicurus *λέγει τὸν ἥλιον τηλικοῦτον ἡλίκος φαίνεται, ἢ μικρῷ τινι μείζω ἢ ἐλάττω.* Cicero, Acad. ii. 82, says "Epicurus autem posse putat [solem] etiam *minorem* esse quam videatur, *sed non multo*, ne maiorem quidem multo putat esse, vel tantum esse quantum videatur."

In view of these statements it seems hardly possible that Lucretius, in stating this position, should have left out the most paradoxical part of it, i.e. that the sun may be a little smaller (as well as larger) than it appears; especially when in the case of the stars (see l. 590) he states the possibility of their being smaller as well as larger.

Thus it seems in the highest degree probable that Lucretius is translating (*patriis exponit chartis*) the text of his master quoted above; the only question is whether his text, as it stands, is a possible translation; and that question I am strongly inclined to answer in the negative. It might be possible to extract the required meaning out of the text by translating *ardor* as a kind of picturesque alias for the sun, "that hot (or bright) body"; though this is to ignore the specific meaning of the word and its ordinary use as a quality. But such a loose and inaccurate use of terms is entirely unlike Lucretius. Lucretius only expounds parts of the system of Epicurus; but in those parts he is, unlike some of his countrymen, most accurately correct, except where the *patrii sermonis egestas* comes in and there is no Latin word to represent what he wants: for instance *αἰσθητήριον* he has to translate incor-

rectly by *sensus*, the convenient *sensorium* being first invented by the schoolmen.

I am thus led to the conclusion that emendation is necessary, and I propose to read, in place of *ardor*, AUTEM "on the other hand." This use of the word is common in Lucretius, as in Plautus. Take as an example Lucr. I. 857

> at neque reccidere ad nilum res posse, neque *autem*
> crescere de nilo testor res ante probatas.

"But I appeal to facts demonstrated above for proof that things cannot fall away to nothing nor *on the other hand* grow from nothing." Munro.

Other examples might be added, e.g. III. 561.

The lines will then run:

> nec nimio solis maior rota nec minor autem
> esse potest nostris quam sensibus esse videtur.

"The disk of the sun cannot be much larger nor on the other hand much smaller than it appears to be to our senses."

It will be observed: (1) that the single subject *rota* suits the singular verb *videtur* better than the two subjects *rota* and *ardor*; (2) that the case of the sun is now exactly parallel with that of the stars which, it is said (l. 590), may be smaller, as well as larger, than they seem; (3) that Lucretius is now made to translate faithfully the text of Epicurus, while before he left out a really important part of it.

It is well known that the source of all our MSS. was much worn at the edges, so that the last words of lines on the right-hand pages have often been mutilated or entirely lost, e.g. *ignes* in l. 585; see also Munro, vol. I. p. 27, and critical note to I. 555. But, according to Lachmann's calculation, l. 564 seems to have been on that side of the leaf which ensures to the end-words comparative immunity from mutilation. I would suggest that the contraction for *autem* was misunderstood, and that an uncritical copyist supplied *ardor* from the immediate context.

2. V. 1081, 1082

> longe alias alio iaciunt in tempore voces,
> et quom de victu certant praedaeque repugnant.

Cormorants and other sea-birds "utter at a different time noises widely different from those they make when they are fighting for food and struggling with their prey." Munro.

There is surely something harsh about the syntax here. 'They utter different cries at different times' is a complete and satisfactory sentence in itself; and it is a shock to find at the beginning of the next line an *et* which must be tacked on to either *alias* or *alio* in the sense of 'than.' In this discussion about language, as elsewhere in Lucretius, *alius* is used constantly either with another *alius*, or followed by *atque ac* or *et*, and meaning 'other': but I find no other passage where it has, as here, to bear both meanings.

I therefore suggest that after 1081 a line is lost of this kind:

et quom progeniem parvam nidosque revisunt,

The similar beginning would readily account for the loss of the line. All is now simple: "the birds utter different cries at different times: at one time when they are feeding their young, at another when they are struggling with their prey." Lachmann and Munro have abundantly proved that the loss of a single verse is a common source of corruption in Lucretius.

J. D. DUFF.

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AND SONS, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Vol. XIX. No. 37.

The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.

INGRAM BYWATER, M.A.

AND

HENRY JACKSON, Litt. D.

London and Cambridge:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO. CAMBRIDGE.
1890

Price 4s. 6d.

CONTENTS. No. XXXVII.

	PAGE
On the Imitation of Homer by Apollonius Rhodius. R. C. Seaton	1
On the Iambic Trimeter. C. A. M. Fennell	14
Homerica. Arthur Platt	19
Propertius III. 18, 3—6. Robinson Ellis	56
Palaeographica. T. W. Allen	62
The Gerousia of Hierapolis. D. G. Hogarth	69
Notes in Latin Lexicography. H. Nettleship	102
Adversaria. H. Nettleship	109
Notes on the Vatican Glossary 3321. H. Nettleship	113
On some Passages of the Silvae of Statius. Hugh Macnaghten	129
Caesar's Invasions of Britain. William Ridgeway	138
The Iambic, A Reply. Arthur Platt	146
Traces of a Saying of the Didache. C. Taylor	148

Now ready, No. XLI., Demy 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

CONTENTS.

I. The Dirae of Valerius Cato. By Robinson Ellis.

II. On the Sentence-Question in Plautus and Terence. Second Paper. By E. P. Morris.

III. Beginnings of the 'Classical' Heroic Couplet in England. By Henry Wood.

IV. A Description of Student Life in Paris in the Twelfth Century. By Kuno Francke.

Notes.—Reviews and Book Notices.—Reports.—Brief Mention.—Recent Publications.—Books Received.—Index.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

Now Ready, 8vo., No. I.—Parts I. and II., and No. II.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY.

Edited by ISAAC FLAGG, WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, and BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER.

No. I. The Cum-Constructions: their History and Functions.
Part I. Critical. By William Gardner Hale. Price 1s. 8d.
Part II. Constructive. Price 3s. 4d.

No. II. Analogy, and the scope of its Application in Language. By Benjamin Ide Wheeler. Price 1s. 3d.

By G. C. Macaulay, M.A.

HERODOTUS. THE HISTORY. Translated into English with Notes and Indices. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 18s.

By H. G. Dakyns, M.A.

XENOPHON. THE WORKS OF. Translated into English, with Introduction and Notes. In Four vols. Vol. I., containing Anabasis; and Books I. and II. of Hellenica. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

By Professor R. C. Jebb, Litt.D., LL.D.

THE ATTIC ORATORS, FROM ANTIPHON TO ISAEOS. 2 vols. 8vo. 25*s.*

SELECTIONS from Antiphon, Andokides, Lysias, Isokrates, and Isaeos. Edited with Notes. New edition (Macmillan's Classical Series). Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

By A. W. Verrall, Litt.D.

EURIPIDES. MEDEA. Edited with Introduction and Notes. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

AESCHYLUS. SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS. Edited with an Introduction, Commentary and Translation. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* School Edition. 6*s.*

— AGAMEMNON. By the same Editor. With translation. 8vo. 12*s.*

STUDIES, LITERARY AND HISTORICAL, IN THE ODES OF HORACE. Demy 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

By Professor T. G. Tucker, M.A.

AESCHYLUS. THE SUPPLICES. A Revised Text, with Introduction, Critical Notes, Commentary and Translation. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

By W. Gunion Rutherford, M.A., LL.D.

THE NEW PHRYNICHUS. Being a revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus, with Introduction and Commentary. 8vo. 18*s.*

BABRIUS. With Introductory Dissertations, Critical Notes, &c. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

THUCYDIDES. Book IV. A Revision of the text, illustrating the Principal Causes of Corruption in the Manuscripts of this Author. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

By J. S. Reid, Litt.D.

CICERO. THE ACADEMICA. The Text revised and explained. 8vo. 15*s.*

— THE ACADEMICS. Translated into English. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

By Walter Leaf, Litt.D.

THE ILIAD. Edited, with English Notes and Introduction. In two volumes. 14*s.* each. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. Vol. II. Books XIII.—XXIV.

By Professor J. E. B. Mayor, M.A.

JUVENAL. THIRTEEN SATIRES OF JUVENAL. With a Commentary. Vol. I. Fourth Edition, Revised and enlarged.—Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II. Second Edition.—Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* SUPPLEMENT to Vol. I. Containing Introduction and Additional Notes to the Edition of 1886. 5*s.*

By Professor J. P. Mahaffy.

RAMBLES AND STUDIES IN GREECE. With Illustrations. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

SOCIAL LIFE IN GREECE; FROM HOMER TO MENANDER. Fifth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT; FROM THE AGE OF ALEXANDER TO THE ROMAN CONQUEST. Crown 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE. In 2 vols., crown 8vo. 9*s.* each. Vol. I. The POETS. With an Appendix on Homer by Prof. SAYCE. Vol. II. The PROSE WRITERS.

*** The second volume may also be had in 2 Parts. Part I. Herodotus to Plato. Part II. Isocrates to Aristotle.

By R. D. Archer-Hind, M.A.

PLATO. PHAEDO. Edited, with Introduction and Notes. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

PLATO. TIMAEUS. Ed., with Introduction, Notes and Translation. 8vo. 16*s.*

By E. G. Hardy, M.A.

PLINY. CORRESPONDENCE WITH TRAJAN. C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi Epistulae ad Traianum Imperatorem cum Eiusdem Responsis. Edited, with Notes and Introductory Essays. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve.

PINDAR. THE OLYMPIAN AND PYTHIAN ODES. Edited by Prof. BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

TRANSLATIONS FROM THE CLASSICS.

ARISTOTLE. THE POLITICS. Translated by Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Head Master of Harrow School. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

ARISTOTLE. THE RHETORIC. By the same Translator. 7*s.* 6*d.*

CICERO. LIFE AND SELECT LETTERS. After the edition of A. WATSON, M.A. Translated by G. E. JEANS, M.A. 2nd Edition, revised. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HOMER. THE ILIAD. Translated into English Prose. By ANDREW LANG, M.A., WALTER LEAF, Litt.D., and ERNEST MYERS, M.A. Crown 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

HOMER. THE ODYSSEY. Done into English by S. H. BUTCHER, M.A., and ANDREW LANG, M.A. Seventh and cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

JUVENAL. THIRTEEN SATIRES. Translated into English after the Text of J. E. B. Mayor by Alexander Leeper, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LIVY. Books XXI.—XXV. Translated by Alfred John Church, M.A., and William Jackson Brodribb, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

PLATO. THE REPUBLIC. Translated into English, with an Analysis and Notes, by J. Ll. Davies, M.A., and D. J. Vaughan, M.A. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

PLATO. EUTHYPHRO, APOLOGY, CRITO AND PHÆDO. Translated by F. J. Church, M.A. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

PLATO. PHAEDRUS, LYSIS, PROTAGORAS. Transl. J. Wright, M.A. 4*s.* 6*d.*

POLYBIUS. THE HISTORIES. Translated from the Text of F. Hultsch. By E. S. Shuckburgh, M.A. Two vols. Crown 8vo. 24*s.*

SALLUST. CATILINE AND JUGURTHA. Translated, with Introductory Essays, by A. W. Pollard, B.A. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.* The CATILINE separately. 3*s.*

TACITUS. The Works of Tacitus. Translated by A. J. Church, M.A., and W. J. Brodribb, M.A. With Notes and Maps. Cr. 8vo. The Annals, 7*s.* 6*d.*; the History, 6*s.*; the Agricola and Germania, with the Dialogue on Oratory, 4*s.* 6*d.*

THEOCRITUS, BION AND MOSCHUS. Rendered into English Prose with Introductory Essay by A. Lang, M.A. New Edition. 18mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

VIRGIL. THE ÆNEID. Translated into English Prose by J. W. Mackail, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GRAMMAR, LANGUAGE, HISTORY & ARCHÆOLOGY.

By H. J. Roby, M.A.

A GRAMMAR OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE FROM PLAUTUS TO SUETONIUS, in two Parts. Crown 8vo. Part I. containing Sounds, Inflexions, Word-Formation, Appendices, &c. Fifth Edition. 9*s.* Part II. Syntax, Prepositions, &c. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

By Professor W. W. Goodwin, LL.D., D.C.L.

SYNTAX OF THE GREEK MOODS AND TENSES. New Edition. Enlarged and re-written. 8vo. 14*s.*

A GREEK GRAMMAR. New Revised Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

By Prof. James Hadley and Prof. F. de Forest Allen.

A GREEK GRAMMAR FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. By James Hadley, late Professor in Yale College. Revised and in part re-written by Frederic de Forest Allen, Professor in Harvard College. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

By Dr G. Autenrieth.

AN HOMERIC DICTIONARY. Translated from the German, with Additions and Corrections and numerous Illustrations. By R. P. Keep, Ph.D. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.*

By John B. Bury, M.A.

A HISTORY OF THE LATER ROMAN EMPIRE FROM ARCADIUS TO IRENE, A.D. 395—800. 2 vols. 8vo. 32*s.*

By J. G. Frazer, M.A.

THE GOLDEN BOUGH: a Study in Comparative Religion. By J. G. Frazer, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 2 vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

By Miss J. E. Harrison and Mrs Verrall.

ANCIENT ATHENS: MYTHOLOGY AND MONUMENTS OF, being a Translation of a portion of the "Attica" of Pausanias, by Margaret de G. Verrall. With Introductory Essay and Archæological Commentary by Jane E. Harrison, Author of "Myths of the Odyssey," "Introductory Studies in Greek Art," &c. With Illustrations and Plans. Crown 8vo. 16*s.*

CLASSICAL SERIES. Some recent Volumes.

EURIPIDES. ION. Edited by M. A. Bayfield, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.*

PLATO. THE REPUBLIC, I—V. Edited by T. H. Warren, M.A. 6*s.*

PLAUTUS. AMPHITRUO. Edited by Arthur Palmer, M.A. 5*s.*

PLINY'S LETTERS. Books I. and II. With Introductions, Notes, and Plan. Edited by James Cowan, M.A. 5*s.*

POLYBIUS. THE HISTORY OF THE ACHAEAN LEAGUE, as contained in the remains of Polybius. Edited by W. W. Capes, M.A. 6*s.* 6*d.*

PLUTARCH. LIVES OF GALBA AND OTHO. Edited by E. G. Hardy, M.A. 6*s.*

TACITUS. THE HISTORIES. Edited by A. D. Godley. Books I. and II. 5*s.* Books III.—V. 5*s.*